LOYAL PUB. S.
1863 - 1
Not M.
Contains
M 125
M 184
M 188
M 170
M 253

LINCOLN NATIONAL
LIFE FOUNDATION



J. Bayard Esq.

W.L. E.B. Mallary's

Compliments

N.Y.

Aug. 16 1826

not in M (1863)

contains M 125, M 184,
M 188, M 170,
M 253

1000
Rare

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

TRACTS

ISSUED BY THE

Loyal Publication Society,

From Feb. 1, 1863, to Feb. 1, 1864.

Nos. 1 to 44.



NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY THE LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

1864.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

DECLARATORY RESOLUTION.

The object of the Society is expressed in the following Resolution, formally adopted by unanimous vote of the Society, at its first Anniversary Meeting, February 13, 1864.

Resolved and declared, That the object of the Loyal Publication Society is, and shall be, to publish and distribute tracts, papers and journals, of unquestionable loyalty, throughout the United States, in the cities and the country, in the army and navy, and in hospitals, thus to diffuse knowledge and stimulate a broad national patriotism, and to aid in the suppression of the Rebellion by the extinction of its causes, and in the preservation of the integrity of the Nation, by counteracting the efforts of the advocates of a disgraceful and disintegrating Peace.

Persons sympathising with the design of this Society, and wishing to contribute to its support, may address

MORRIS KETCHUM, Esq., Treasurer, 40 Exchange Place,

by whom receipts will be promptly returned.

OFFICERS OF THE SOCIETY.

President.

FRANCIS LIEBER.

Treasurer.

MORRIS KETCHUM.

Secretary.

JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS, Jr.

Finance Committee.

JAMES A. ROOSEVELT, Chairman,
T. B. CODDINGTON,
DAVID DOWS,
WILLIAM E. DODGE, Jr.
JACKSON S. SCHULTZ.

Publication Committee.

JAMES McKAYE, Chairman,
GROSVENOR P. LOWREY,
DR. F. SCHUTZ,
GEO. P. PUTNAM,
JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS, Jr.,
CHARLES ASTOR BRISTED,
THEODORE G. GLAUBENSKLEE.

Executive Committee.

WILLIAM T. BLODGETT, Chairman,
CHRISTIAN E. DETMOLD,
GEORGE GIBBS,
SINCLAIR TOUSEY,
CHARLES BUTLER,
J. BUTLER WRIGHT,
LE GRAND B. CANNON,
W. C. CHURCH,
BURR W. GRISWOLD.

CONTENTS.

No. 1. Future of the North West. By *Robert Dale Owen.*
2. Echo from the Army. Extracts from Letters of Soldiers.
3. Union Mass Meeting, Cooper Institute, March 6, 1863. Speeches of *Brady, Van Buren, &c.*
4. Three Voices: the Soldier, Farmer and Poet.
5. Voices from the Army. Letters and Resolutions of Soldiers.
6. Northern True Men. Addresses of Connecticut Soldiers—Extracts from Richmond Journals.
7. Speech of Major-General Butler. Academy of Music, New York, April 2, 1863.
8. Separation; War without End. *Ed. Laboulaye.*
9. The Venom and the Antidote. Copperhead declarations. Soldiers' Letters.
10. A few words in behalf of the Loyal Women of the United States, by *One of Themselves.*
11. No Failure for the North. *Atlantic Monthly.*
12. Address to King Cotton. *Eugene Pelletan.*
13. How a Free People conduct a long War. *Stillé.*
14. The Preservation of the Union, a National Economic Necessity.
15. Elements of Discords in Secessia. By *William Alexander, Esq.,* of Texas.
16. No Party now, but all for our Country. *Francis Lieber.*
17. The Cause of the War. *Col. Charles Anderson.*
18. Opinions of the early Presidents and of the Fathers of the Republic upon Slavery, and upon Negroes as Men and Soldiers.
19. **Einheit und Freiheit, von Hermann Rafter.**
20. Military Despotism! Suspension of the Habeas Corpus! &c.
21. Letter addressed to the Opera-House Meeting, Cincinnati. By *Col. Charles Anderson.*
22. Emancipation is Peace. *By Robert Dale Owen.*
23. Letter of Peter Cooper on Slave Emancipation.
24. Patriotism. Sermon by the *Rev. Jos. Fransioli,* of St. Peter's (Catholic) Church, Brooklyn.

M 263
M 170
F 225 M 125

No. 25. The Conditions of Reconstruction, by *Robert Dale Owen.*

26. Letter to the President, by *Gen. A. J. Hamilton*, of Texas. F379 M184

27. Nullification and Compromise: a Retrospective View. By *John Mason Williams.*

28. The Death of Slavery. Letter from Peter Cooper to Gov. Seymour.

29. Slavery Plantations and the Yeomanry. *Francis Lieber.*

30. Rebel Conditions of Peace. Extracts from Richmond Journals.

31. Address of the Loyal Leagues, Utica, October 20, 1863.

32. War Power of the President—Summary Imprisonment. By *J. Heermans.* F608 M188

33. The Two Ways of Treason.

34. The Monroe Doctrine. By *Edward Everett*, &c.

35. The Arguments of Secessionists. *Francis Lieber.*

36. Prophecy and Fulfillment. Letter of A. H. Stephens—Address of E. W. Gantt.

37. How the South Rejected Compromise, &c. Speech of Mr. Chase in Peace Conference of 1861.

38. Letters on our National Struggle. By *Brigadier-General Thomas Francis Meagher.*

39. Bible View of Slavery, by John H. Hopkins, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of Vermont. Examined by *Henry Drisler.*

40. The Conscription Act: a Series of Articles. By *Geo. B. Butler, N. Y.*

41. Réponse de MM. De Gasparin, Laboulaye, &c.

42. Reply of Messrs. Gasparin, Laboulaye, and others.

43. **Antwort der Herren De Gasparin, Laboulaye, Martin, Cochin, an die Loyal National League.**

44. First Anniversary Meeting of the Loyal Publication Society.

No. 1.] Loyal Publication Society,
863 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

THE

FUTURE OF THE NORTH-WEST:

IN CONNECTION WITH

THE SCHEME OF RECONSTRUCTION

WITHOUT NEW ENGLAND.

ADDRESSED TO THE PEOPLE OF INDIANA.

More than a third of a century since, I found a home, Citizens of Indiana, among you. Kindly you received me. Largely have you bestowed on me your confidence. I owe to you honorable station and a debt of gratitude. Let me endeavor, now in your hour of danger, to repay, if in part I may, that debt.

On the future of our country clouds and darkness rest. We are engaged in a war as terrible as any which history records; an outrage on civilization, if it be not God's agency for a great purpose. All good citizens earnestly desire its termination. The fervent longing of every Christian man and woman is for the restoration of peace.

To this righteous desire there are addressed, especially here in our North-West, certain proposals of compromise and accommodation. Shall we take counsel as to what these are worth? Can we reason together on a subject of interest more vital to ourselves and to our children?

But before we scan the future, let us glance at the past. Ere we advance, let us determine where we stand, and ascertain how we came hither. Looking back on our steps throughout the last two years, let us, in a dispassionate spirit, by the aid of authentic and unimpeachable documents, very briefly examine the causes, underlying a stupendous national convulsion, which have resulted in the present condition of things.

The secession ordinance passed the Convention of South Carolina, December 20, 1860. The next day, December 21, the Convention adopted the "Declaration of Causes," justifying secession. In language plain as can be desired are these causes set forth. They all center in one complaint, Northern encroachment on slavery; there *is* no other cause alleged.

What proof of such encroachment is offered? First, the

allegation that "for years past" fourteen Northern States, among which Indiana is named, "have deliberately refused to fulfill their Constitutional obligations" (as regards the fugitive-slave-law) by "enacting laws which either nullify the acts of Congress or render useless any attempt to execute them." But if you have looked through our statute-book, you know that no such law then existed, or ever existed, there. That solemn Declaration, inaugurating a war as fearful as ever desolated a nation, is based, so far as regards our State, on a statement either ignorantly or wilfully false.

If, in regard to any of the other States named, there be truth in the allegation;—if, in any one or more of these, there existed then, a state law nullifying or rendering nugatory a Constitutional provision;—none knew better than these South Carolinians what their easy, peaceful, effectual remedy was:—an appeal to the Supreme Court. That Court has sovereign control over all unconstitutional laws. Had the South no chance of justice—of more than justice—before the Supreme Court of the United States? Be the Dred Scott decision the reply!

A thing, to be credited, must have some semblance of common sense. Will any man believe that the citizens of South Carolina—who would find it difficult to prove that by the unconstitutionality of State laws at the North they had lost twenty slaves since their State first joined the Union—will any sane man believe that South Carolina sought to break up that Union for cause so utterly trivial as that?

No! far deeper must we search for the true cause. It is plainly set forth in the latter paragraphs of the Declaration, in which the Convention speaks, not of any special laws, but of "the action of the non-slaveholding States."

It declares that these States have "denied the rights of property established in fifteen of the States and recognized by the Constitution;" that they "have denounced as sinful the institution of slavery;" that they "have united in the election of a man to the high office of President of the United States whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery;" who declares that "the Government cannot endure permanently half slave, half free," and that "the public mind must rest in the belief that slavery is in the course of ultimate extinction." And it winds up by this assertion: "All hope of remedy is rendered vain by the fact that the public opinion of the North has invested a great political error with the sanctions of a more erronious religious belief."

These South Carolinian sentiments, afterward endorsed by every seceding State, are doubtless, in substance, sincere. They may be received as the secession creed. Though loosely worded

they are intelligible. Taken in connection with the steadily-progressing increase, disclosed each ten years by the census, of population and Congressional votes and consequent political influence in the Free States as compared with the Slave, they disclose, beyond question, the true cause of the gigantic insurrection that has made desolate so many domestic hearths, and spread war and devastation where peace and tranquillity used to reign.

It is, of course, not true, that the Northern States, as States, have denied the rights of Southern property, or denounced slavery as sinful. The Convention could only mean that certain citizens of these States had expressed such sentiments; or as they afterward phrase it, that public opinion in the North had given the sanction of religion to a great political error.

I pray you to remark that the South secedes from the Union *because of these opinions.* She will not remain in fellowship with States in which such opinions are expressed. She holds that men ought not to be allowed to say or to write that slavery is sinful, or that religion does not sanction it. She hangs those who say or write such things within her own borders.* To satisfy her, such opinions must be suppressed also among us. But the Constitution provides that "Congress shall make no law abridging the liberty of speech or of the press." Here is a difficulty. How shall we of the North satisfy a slaveholding South, unless we not only surrender the dearest of a freeman's rights, but also either violate the Constitution, or else amend it so that free thought and free speech shall be among past and forgotten things?

But these outspoken sentiments are not our only offense. We are accused of having elected a President "whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery;" and who believes that "slavery is in the course of ultimate extinction."

Because of the election of such a President, the slaveholders of the South secede. They do not wait to see what he will do. They secede before he is inaugurated. They secede, then, not because of his acts, but because of his opinions.

His opinions on the subject of slavery; the same opinions which, for a century past, have been spreading and swelling into action throughout the civilized world; the same opinions which have taken practical form and shape—which have become law—till not a Christian nation in Europe, Spain alone excepted, stands out against them. Look at the array of names!

* "Let an abolitionist come within the borders of South Carolina, if we can catch him we will try him, and notwithstanding all the interference of all the Governments on earth, including the Federal Government, we will hang him."—*Senator Preston, in debate in U. S. Senate, January,* 1838.

"If chance throw an abolitionist into our hands, he may expect a felon's death." *Senator Hammond of South Carolina, in Senate,* 1836.

England led the way. In 1834 she emancipated all her slaves. King Oscar of Sweden followed her example in 1846. Then came Denmark in 1847; France, in 1848; Portugal, in 1856; the vast empire of Russia, in 1862. Finally, with nearly thirty years' experience in English colonies and fifteen years' experience in those of France before her eyes, plain, practical, unimaginative Holland, by a vote in her Chambers of forty-five to seven, gave freedom, with compensation, to her forty-five thousand slaves; to take effect on the first of July next.

And our offense in Southern eyes—an offense so grievous that it is held to justify insurrection and its thousand horrors—our unpardonable sin is, that we have elected a President whose opinions regarding negro servitude are those of all Christendom; whose belief that "slavery is in the course of ultimate extinction," is but the plain inevitable deduction from the last thirty years' history of the civilized world.

Observe, I pray, that in thus setting forth the causes which produced this fratricidal war, I have let the South speak for herself. Nor have I cited against her vagrant opinions, carelessly expressed by her citizens. I have quoted, word for word, from her solemn deliberate "Declaration of Causes;" that document which is to Secessiondom, what the Declaration of Independence was to the United States. Out of her own mouth I have condemned her.

Yet I am not assuming to sit in judgment on her motives. I but show you where the difficulty lies, and how deep-sunk and radical it is. Opinions (she declares) stand in the way. Based on a religious sentiment, these opinions render vain (she says) all hope of remedy; for her Government is founded on opinions diametrically the reverse. And I show you further, that in this she stands alone among the nations calling themselves civilized. Alexander H. Stephens, whom, in February, 1861, she named her Vice President, with commendable frankness admits that she does so. In Savannah, the Mayor presiding, Mr. Stephens, addressing an immense crowd on the 21st of March following his election, spoke thus: "Slavery is the natural and moral condition of the negro. This, our new Government, is the first, in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth."*

Alone she stands! the first government, in the history of the world, founded on the principle—"Slavery is good; slavery is moral; slavery is just;" the only people in all the eighteen

* Speech of Mr. Stephens as reported in the "*Savannah Republican.*" It is thence copied into "*Putnam's Rebellion Record,*" vol. i., document 48, pp. 44 to 49. The *Republican,* in publishing this address, says: "Mr. Stephens took his seat amid a burst of enthusiasm and applause, such as the Athenæum has never had displayed within its walls in the memory of the oldest inhabitant."

centuries since Christ preached justice and mercy, who rose in rebellion because, among their brethren, His religion was appealed to in favor of that emancipation which, within the last thirty years, England, and France, and Sweden, and Denmark, and Portugal, and Russia, and Holland, have all conceded—a tribute to Christian civilization.

Thus, then. Opinions not carried out in practice—opinions unfavorable to slavery expressed in the North, and held by the President elect—the same opinions that are entertained and have been acted upon by almost every civilized nation—these, according to Southern declaration, were the immediate causes of the war: opinions, not acts; the acts were all the other way.

Inaugurated on the 4th of March, 1861, Abraham Lincoln expressly reassumed, in his Message, the ground occupied by himself, and by a large majority of his supporters, before the election. "I have no purpose" (said he), "directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists." He went much further. Alluding, in the same Message, to an amendment to the Constitution, which had passed Congress on the 28th of February, to the effect that no amendment shall ever be made to the Constitution authorizing Congress to interfere with slavery in any State, the President said: "I have no objection to its being made express and irrevocable."

This was the first act: an offer sanctioned by Congress, endorsed by the President, so to amend the Constitution, that never, while the world lasted, should the power be given to Congress, by any subsequent amendment, to interfere with slavery.

The scene when, on Mr. Corwin's motion, this amendment passed, is recorded in the newspapers of the day. "As the vote proceeded, the excitement was intense, and on the announcement of the result, the inexpressible enthusiasm of the members and the crowded galleries found vent in uproarious demonstrations. All feel that it is the harbinger of peace."*

Was it the harbinger of peace? Did this concession—bordering surely on humiliation—a promise, as to slavery, never through all time to amend our acts no matter how we may change our opinions—did this unheard-of concession to the slave interest conciliate the South, or arrest her action? It passed by, like the idle wind. State after State seceded. Security against the encroachment alleged to be intended—the amplest within the bounds of possibility—had, indeed, been offered; but the remedy did not reach the case. Opinions remained unchanged; and the rebellion was against opinions.

* *N. Y. Commercial*, February 28, 1861.

Men in the North still said that human servitude was sinful. The President still believed that "slavery is in the course of ultimate extinction." No fraternity with such men! No obedience to such a President!

And yet this President, in the same Inaugural from which I have quoted, pushed forbearance to the verge of that boundary beyond which it ceases to be a virtue. "The Government" (he said to the Secessionists already in arms against lawful authorty)—"the Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors." And in mild but cogent terms he reminded them of his and their relative situations, and of the final necessity which his position imposed upon him. "You have no oath" (he said) "registered in Heaven to destroy the Government: while I have the most solemn one to preserve, protect, and defend it."

He spoke to the deaf adder. As if they *had* sworn before God to destroy the Government under which, for eighty years, they had enjoyed prosperity and protection, they became the aggressors. Unassailed by that Government, they opened fire, on the memorable twelfth of April, from the batteries of Charleston, on Fort Sumter.

The echo of that cannonade reverberated throughout the Union. The North rose up, like a strong man from sleep. It needed not the President's Proclamation, issued three days thereafter, to call men forth. In advance of that call, the farmer had left his plow in the furrow; the mechanic had deserted his workshop. The People had taken the war in hand.

Such were the causes of this rebellion; such were the acts on either side.

What have been the results? The war, as wars in their commencement always are, was popular. Men engaged in it, as in a new and stirring enterprise men are wont to do, with enthusiasm. Unmingled successes, a prompt and triumphant termination—these, as always happens, were confidently anticipated. But the usual checkered fortunes of war attended our arms; now a victory, now a defeat. The contest was protracted. Visionary hopes of speedy triumph faded away. Then came revulsion of feeling, sinking of spirit. There never was a protracted war in this world, no matter how successful in the end, without just such a reaction. How did the souls of our revolutionary fathers, sore tried, sink within them, year after year—how often did Washington himself despair—before the final victory that heralded American Independence! England is still one of the greatest nations of the world, proud, powerful, prosperous; yet, during her five years' Peninsular war (in Spain against Napoleon) the depression in England was almost beyond ex-

ample. At the commencement of that war the people accepted it with acclamation. Opposite parties in Parliament vied with each other in their zeal to vote men and money. Before a year had passed, how changed was the scene! The retreat and defeat at Corunna (the Bull Run of that year's campaign) plunged the nation in despair. Nothing was talked of but the stupid blunders of the Government, its absurd and contradictory orders, its gross ignorance of the first principles of war. Croakers spoke loudly of the folly of any attempt to check the progress of the French arms in Spain. Universal distrust seized the public mind. The Ministry kept their places with extreme difficulty. But England's *pluck* bore her through. She spent four hundred and fifty millions a year, bought gold at thirty per cent premium to pay her troops, persevered to the end—and conquered: yet not till her Government stocks, ordinarily at 90, had come to stand habitually at 65; nay, before Napoleon was finally conquered, had fallen to 53 (payable in depreciated paper), and had been negotiated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer at that rate.

Nor let it be imagined that it was the uninformed masses alone who despaired. The greatest men shared the doubt whether England was not tottering to her destruction. Sir Walter Scott wrote to a friend: "These cursed, double cursed news from Spain have sunk my spirits so much that I am almost at disbelieving a Providence. There is an evil fate upon us in all we do at home or abroad." A letter of Sir James Mackintosh is still more gloomy. "I believe, like you" (he writes to a friend at Vienna), "in a resurrection, because I believe in the immortality of civilization; but a dark and stormy night, a black series of ages, may be prepared for our posterity before the dawn of a better day. The race of man may reach the promised land, but there is no assurance that the present generation will not perish in the wilderness." *

Such is the dark valley, shadowed by despondency, through which even the most powerful nation, once engaged in a great contest of life and death, must consent to travel ere it emerges to the light. If we were not prepared to traverse its depths—if we have not courage to endure even to the end—we ought never to have entered upon the gloomy road at all. Many good men thought, at the outset, that the wiser course was to let the deluded South go in peace. A thousand times better to have done this than to falter and look back now, false to the great task we have undertaken, recreant to the solemn purpose on

* A pamphlet by C. J. Stillé, on this subject, giving many more details, is well worth studying. Its title is, "*How a free people conduct a great war.*" Published by Collins, Philadelphia.

which we have lavished millions of treasure, to which we have set the seal of our best blood. That which might have been graceful concession two years since, would be base submission to-day.

Base and unavailing! What are the proposals now, rife throughout the North-West, among the friends of peace-at-any-price? Worst devise of feeble or faithless heads, busily echoed by thousands of faint hearts, embodied in public resolutions, trumpeted through hundreds of newspapers, what is the favorite project, long matured in secret, that is urged upon you to-day by the enemies of the war and of the Administration that conducts it?

Of vast import is that project, yet a few words suffice to state it. The greatest of human changes can be expressed in one word—Death!

The project is, to reconstruct the Union, leaving out the New England States.

This plan is spoken of as a compromise. The South, abandoning her avowed intention to erect a separate purely slave-holding Confederacy, is to consent to receive into her fellowship a portion of the Northern States. The Northern States, in return, are to abandon six of their number; those six in which the opinions against which the war is waged chiefly prevail.

But this plan is no after-thought—no compromise whatever. It has been in the minds and intentions of the Southern leaders from the very commencement of the rebellion.

I vouch for the truth of the following: Early in January, 1861, a few days after South Carolina had seceded, and before any other State had followed her example, Senator Benjamin, of Louisiana, said to one of the Foreign Ministers: "A great revolution has commenced. It will end in the separation from the Union either of the slave States or of New England."

Within a few days of the same time, before Jefferson Davis had left Washington, Mrs. Davis, conversing with a friend from Pennsylvania, who had been lamenting a probable separation, replied, in substance: "Do not afflict yourself. We shall not separate from Pennsylvania, nor New York, nor New Jersey; they, like the North-West, are our natural allies."

It was the original plan, abandoned for a time, when the entire North rose in arms; unavowed even now; yet secretly fomented and sanctioned ever since the elections seemed to result adversely to the Administration, and since meetings and newspapers, calling themselves Democratic, have been sending forth, to an enemy in arms, words of sympathy and comfort.

Well might such a plan be the first choice of the secessionists! Well may they intrigue with the North-West to favor and

adopt it now! Far better for them than a mere Southern Confederacy, never was a more specious nor a more daring device to uphold a sinking cause!

Look at it, I pray you; not vaguely or hastily, but carefully, and in all its practical details. In the Senate, *thirty* Southern votes to *twenty-two* Northern; in the House, *ninety* Southern votes to *a hundred and thirteen* Northern. One House hopelessly gone; while twelve votes changed would give a Southern majority in the other. And when has Congress seen the day when twice twelve votes could not have been had from Northern Representatives for any measure the South saw fit to propose?

Just North enough in the scheme to afford protection and support to slavery; and *not* North enough to exert over it the slightest influence or control.

Plausible, too! "You have a majority in one House, and we in the other. What can be more fair?"

But mark the workings of the plan! A free State applies for admission. The Bill must pass the Senate. Will it pass? Slaveholders have to decide that question. Will they relinquish the balance of power which they hold in their grasp? While they retain their reason, never! A slave State for every free State admitted; that will be the rule. The controlling majority in the Senate, therefore, perpetual!

Think, next, of the nominations by the President—a President, of course, who believes in the justice, and in the perpetual duration of negro slavery—for none other will be suffered to take his seat; nominations of Cabinet officers; of Foreign Ministers and Consuls; of Judges of the Supreme Court; of Generals in the army; of men to all lucrative Post-offices; of Registers and Receivers, and all the long list of other nominations to offices in the gift of the President and confirmatory by the Senate. Will the name of one man pass the ordeal who thinks human servitude a sin or an evil, or who believes that "slavery is in the course of ultimate extinction?"

It will be a Senate requiring a political test for office that would have excluded Washington, if proposed for Brigadier-General, or Jefferson, if nominated as a member of the Cabinet. For Washington, on the 9th of September, 1786, wrote to John F. Mercer, of Maryland: "It is among my first wishes to see some plan adopted by which slavery in this country may be abolished by law."* And Jefferson, in his "Summary View of the Rights of British America," originally published in August, 1774, said: "The abolition of domestic slavery is the great object of desire in these Colonies, where it was, unhappily, introduced in their infant state;"† while, eight years later, in his

* *Sparks' Washington*, vol. ix., p. 159. † *Jefferson's Works*, vol. i., p. 185.

"Notes on Virginia," he falls into that "erroneous religious belief" which, according to the South Carolina Declaration, renders hopeless all remedy for the grievances of the South. Adverting to a possible conflict, in the future, between slave and slaveholder, he says: "The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest." *

If this view of revolutionary opinions should happen to surprise you, it will be because you are less accurately informed on the subject than the Vice President of the insurrectionary States. Let Mr. Stephens have credit for the honesty with which, in the address from which I have already quoted, he made this confession: "The prevailing ideas entertained by Jefferson and most of the leading statesmen, at the time of the formation of the old Constitution, were, that the enslavement of the African was in violation of the laws of nature; that it was wrong in principle, socially, morally, and politically." The "ultimate extinction" heresy, too, was shared by these men, as Mr. Stephens thus reminds us: "Slavery was an evil they knew not well how to deal with; but the general opinion of the men of that day was, that, somehow or other, in the order of Providence, the institution would be evanescent, and pass away." †

Reconstruct the Union without New England, and no man who shares these revolutionary sentiments,—no man who believes as Washington and Jefferson believed,—can ever reach the Presidential chair, or ever receive, from the occupant of that chair, any office, at home or abroad, civil or military, of any importance whatever.

The vast patronage of the Government—the tens of millions annually in its gift—would become a gigantic bribe. Its demoralizing influence in calling forth professions of a money-getting creed, would be immense.

But well would it be if this wholesale premium on hypocrisy were the only evil, or the worst evil, which a South-controlled Congress would bring upon us. What laws would such a Congress pass?

The characteristic political doctrine universally asserted throughout the South is this: "The Constitution provides that 'the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States.' Therefore all citizens are entitled, wherever they may reside, to equal rights of property. Neither the Federal Government nor a State has a right to discriminate between different kinds of property, legally held. It is unconstitutional to declare by law that any legally

* *Jefferson's Writings*, vol. viii., p. 404.

† Address of A. H. Stephens, reported, as stated in a previous note, in the "*Savannah Republican.*"

held property *is* property in one portion of the Union, and is *not* property in another. It is equally unconstitutional for the Federal Government, or for any State, to pass laws which shall prohibit the transfer of any legally held property from one portion of the Union to another; or to enact that any one species of property legally used in any one State or Territory may not be used in another.

"But slaves are property: as absolutely and legally articles of merchandise (though differing in kind) as horses, or cattle, or flocks of sheep; property righteously as well as legally held; property the holding of which is based on a great physical, philosophical, and moral truth, and is sanctioned by religion.

"Therefore, wherever one citizen may lawfully take or use his cattle and horses and flocks of sheep, another citizen may lawfully take and use his slaves. To prohibit him from so doing is a moral wrong, as well as an unconstitutional act." *

That is the openly-avowed doctrine and demand of the South. Individual exceptions to such opinions there are, of course, in the slave States, just as, in the free States, men are found who believe that slavery is enjoined by morality and sanctioned by religion. But the official declarations of the South prove, and no honest slaveholder will deny, that I have here fairly and candidly stated the leading article, never to be relinquished, of their political creed.

Upon this doctrine was based that claim of the South to equal rights of settlement in the Territories, the expected denial of which was one of the chief incentives to this war. But it is evident that if the doctrine be tenable at all, it applies as justly to a State as to a Territory. An Indianian may buy a Kentucky farm and settle thereon with all his movable property. Shall a Kentuckian be forbidden to settle, in like manner, on a farm in Indiana, unless he shall first sell the most valuable movable property he possesses?

It is not more certain that the earth will continue to revolve around the sun, than that the South, while slaveholding, will persevere, whenever and wherever she obtains the political ascendency, in asserting and enforcing by law what she regards as her political rights in this matter.

* If any man doubt that this *is* the claim maintained by the South, and short of which she will never be satisfied, let him read the *note* on the last page of this pamphlet, on recent legal opinions and decisions touching slaves.

These afford conclusive proof that the South, with the power in her hands, would declare null and void, because in violation of the Constitution of the United States, the provision in the Constitution of Indiana excluding negroes. Should we tolerate a similar provision excluding our horses and cattle from Kentucky? A State cannot, without the consent of Congress, even lay a duty on property brought within her limits from another State; far less, of course, can she exclude it altogether.

Choose, then, farmers of Indiana! citizens of the North-West! Strike off twenty-nine votes from the northern majority of the House. Abandon, by the cession of twelve votes more, your present majority in the Senate. Consent to the dismemberment of your country. Relinquish for ever to the South the balance of legislative power. Do this, if you will. But bear in mind, that on the day you assent to the scandalous compact, you will have virtually repealed that noble ORDINANCE to which the North-West owes not freedom only, but a social and commercial prosperity far outstripping that of any slave-tilled State. Bear in mind that on that day you will have to decide, which of two alternatives you will advise your sons to select;—to regard honest labor as unbecoming a gentleman, or to take their chance of working in sight of the overseer, side by side with the slave.

Do all this, if good it seem to you. I make no argument against it. Facts, not counsels, are what I offer you. I but seek to shed daylight on the slaveholders' project; to show you, beforehand, what it is you are invited to do.

The invitation is, to unite your fate with a slave empire; not an empire part free and part slave, but an empire *all* slave; an empire in every portion of which slavery will be permitted by law, and restricted as to the number of slaves by soil and climate alone. The invitation is to become, yourselves, part and parcel of such an empire; to enter into fellowship with those who, not content to legalize slavery, canonize it also; regard it as philosophical, commend it as moral, extol it as religious: who adopt it as the corner-stone of the social edifice and the basis of the political system.

The invitation is, to ignore, or to defy, the public sentiment of Christendom. The invitation is to stand still, or sink back, while all other civilized nations advance. An eminent writer, alluding to certain ancient collegiate foundations of Europe, declared that they were not without their use to the historian of the human mind: immovably moored to the same station by the strength of their cables and the weight of their anchors, they served to mark the rapidity of the current with which the rest of the world was borne along. Is such to be the fate and the vocation of America, once proud, powerful, freedom-loving? Is God's mighty current of Progress to sweep past her, as she lies paralyzed, weighted down, rock-stranded, by her political sins?

This invitation is given on conditions. The first is, that throughout this slave empire, no man shall be allowed to deny the "great physical, philosophical, and moral truth", now first recognized, upon which the new Government is founded; namely, that slavery is the natural and moral condition of the African

negro. No man is to be permitted, on pain of punishment, to argue that slavery is sinful, or that religion condemns it. We are required to go back to the spirit of those days when it was held to be seditious to question, by speech or writing, the idea on which the existing Government was based; to the Tudor and Stuart age of England: the only difference being that while under the old English rule, it was punishable as sedition to question the right divine of Kings, under the new Southern rule, sedition is to be punished when it questions the right divine of slavery. It will be a remarkable experiment, in the nineteeth century, to establish a government upon a principle which will not bear question, or suffer an argument touching its truth or its merits. The despotism of Naples recently went down, crushed by the difficulties and the odium of maintaining, in these modern days, a similar state of things.

The second condition demanded of us is, that the North, before it is admitted to Southern fellowship, shall cast off six of her States; thus curtailing her power and her possessions by the surrender of nearly one-fifth of her population and more than one-fifth of her wealth.

And here discloses itself the Hercules foot of this most audacious scheme. Think of proposing to Great Britain, that she should set Scotland adrift, or to France that she should detach and abandon all Normandy! When was dismemberment ever dreamed of or demanded, except by a victor from a prostrate foe?

And will no other demands be made based on the same relative condition of the contracting parties? The Southern insurrection will have cost its authors a thousand millions, at the least. Can any man doubt that the North, once entrapped into this base compact, will be held to pay her full share of that stupendous sum?—not only to accept as justifiable an insurrection against lawful authority, but to pay what that insurrection cost? And will nothing be included in that cost but the bare expenses of the war? Is it not certain, beyond possible doubt, that there will be thousands upon thousands of claims for damages—for plantations ruined, for dwellings destroyed, for cotton burnt, for hundreds of thousands of slaves lost—from every Southern State that has been reached by our arms? and that these claims will amount to hundreds of millions, exceeding probably the war expenses themselves? On whom is to be imposed the enormous tax that is to pay for these ravages of war? On whom but on those who inflicted them? And when such a tax is levied and paid by you, what acknowledgment can be imagined more practically conclusive of the admission that the so-called insurrection was no insurrection at all, but, on the contrary, a noble war for

liberty and independence, just in its inception, triumphant in its result?

Their hewers of wood and drawers of water we should become; the recorders of their edicts; the submissive agents to execute their good pleasure!

And if we yield now, so should we be! If with half the territory constituting the Slave States virtually in our possession, we accept at the hands of armed enemies the very plan they themselves had chalked out before a cannon was fired, richly shall we deserve our fate! Under such a plan the insurgents would not merely have secured their own independence: conquerors over us, they would have mastered ours. Have we mercy to expect? Woe to the vanquished!

Let there be no self-deception. If we are to do this thing, let us look it honestly in the face, and make plain to ourselves what it is we are doing. We give up; we surrender; we acknowledge (twenty millions against six) *that we are beaten.* Yet that is a trifle: the bravest may be defeated; the holiest cause may fail. But we, if we take this step, must consent to repentance as well as to submission. Before the world we must confess our sins. Before the world our acts must declare, that from the first, we were in the wrong and the South in the right. Before the world our acts must declare, that a thousand millions have been squandered—that a hundred thousand brave men have sunk from the battle-field to the grave—all in a disgraceful warfare, all in an iniquitous cause.

And the retrospect, when this war, thus stigmatized as aggressive and faithless, is brought to a shameful close! The scene, when the thinned ranks of a hundred Indiana regiments, whose gallant deeds, untarnished by a single disgrace, have been till now the pride and boast of their State—the scene of bitter humiliation, when these brave and war-worn men shall return—to find themselves degraded from patriots to marauders; their labors counted but an outrage, their wounds a disgrace; shall return, to hear their dead comrades spoken of as mercenaries hired by the oppressor, and justly overtaken by the oppressor's fate; shall return, to find the war-made widow pensionless, the soldier's orphan cast helpless on the mercy of the world!

And then the scene—it may be far more terrible yet—when Indiana, base and craven, shall put forth her hand attempting to sign the compact of degradation!

Attempting to sign! Will the attempt ever be consummated? In peace, without bloodshed, without the hand of brother raised against brother, of father against son—never! Until Indiana shall have shared a worse fate than Missouri or

Kentucky, or Virginia; until her fields shall be desolate, her cities spoiled, her substance wasted; until we shall have learned, by sickening experience, the nightly terrors, the daily horrors of civil war—never! Will the men who have stood firm while shot and shell decimated their ranks, turn cowards on their return to their native State, and patiently suffer it? So sure as God lives, never—never!

Let Indiana, belying the courage she has shown on the battle field, casting from her the last remnant of self-respect, false to her constitutional obligations, blind to a future of abject servility, deaf alike to the warnings of revolutionary wisdom and to the voice of Civilization speaking to-day in her ears—let Indiana, selling Freedom's birthright for less than Esau's price, resolve to purchase Southern favor by Northern dismemberment and the world-wide contempt that would follow it—but let her know, before she enters that path of destruction, that her road will lie over the bodies of her murdered sons, past prostrate cabins, past ruined farms, through all the desolation that fire and sword can work. Let her know, that before she can link her fate to a system that is as surely doomed to ultimate extinction as the human body is finally destined to death, there will be a war within her own borders to which all we have yet endured, will be but as the summer's gale, that scatters a few branches over the highway, compared to the hurricane that plows its broad path of ruin, mile after mile, leaving behind, in its track, a prostrate forest, harvest crops uprooted, and human habitations overthrown.

But the hurricane is of God's sending. Whether the tempest of war, from which He has hitherto mercifully preserved our State, shall now sweep over it, as it has swept over the ill-fated Southern border, depends, Citizens of Indiana, upon you. Courage, prudence, patriotism will avert it. Faint-heartedness and folly will bring it down upon our heads. If it come, God help the present generation that has to endure it! God help our children after us, to whom we bequeath a North-West steeped in scandalous dependence, so long as she submits to her masters, and a prey to a second civil war, so soon as she awakes to her true condition, and draws the sword once more, to redeem the errors of the past!

ROBERT DALE OWEN.

March 4, 1863.

NOTE, *as to recent legal opinions and decisions touching slavery.*—The direct question whether slaves brought by their masters to reside in a Free State become free—in other words, whether a State law be constitutional which declares free all slaves, not fugitives, who may come within the limits of the State,—has never been brought before the Supreme Court.

But in the Dred Scott case the opinion delivered by the Court was based on principles, the practical application of which appears to establish the right of an owner of slaves to their "service and labor" throughout life, no matter where that life may be spent.

Chief Justice Taney, in that opinion, declares: That negroes imported from Africa, were "brought here as articles of merchandise;" that in every one of the thirteen colonies which formed the Constitution of the United States, "a negro of the African race was regarded as an article of property, and held and bought and sold as such," and that, at the time the Constitution was adopted, the negro was "treated as an ordinary article of merchandise and traffic, whenever a profit could be made by it." As such Chief Justice regards him.

Dred Scott, the plaintiff in this case, a slave owned in Missouri by Dr. Emerson, had been taken by his owner into Illinois, kept there two years, then kept two years in a Territory of the United States north of the Missouri Compromise line, while that Compromise was in force, and had then been brought back to Missouri.

The Court, after reciting that "Scott was a slave when taken into the State of Illinois *and there held as such*," decided that when brought back to Missouri he remained a slave, inasmuch as "his *status*, as free or slave, depended *on the laws of Missouri, not of Illinois.*"

So also of his residence in a Territory declared free by a law of the United States. The Court held the law to be unconstitutional and void, because the Constitution recognizes a slave as property, and "makes no distinction between that property and any other." And the Court decides that Scott cannot be liberated under such a law.

Though the question did not come before the Court for decision, whether Scott could have been held for life as a slave in Illinois, yet it is a fair inference from the above, that that question also would be decided in the affirmative. Either Scott, while residing with Dr. Emerson in Illinois, was his slave or he was not. If his slave, as the words of Chief Justice Taney would imply, then slaveholders may hold their slaves to service and labor in a Free State. If not his slave, he was a freeman. But if a freeman, how could any law of Missouri be held again to reduce him to slavery?

In the Lemmon case (before the New York Court of Appeals, January, 1860), in which the question came up, whether slaves owned by a Virginian in transit through the State of New York became free, the Court decided (five against three) in favor of the slaves. But the arguments of the counsel (O'Conor) assigned by the State of Virginia for the slaveowner, clearly indicate the character and extent of Southern claims in this matter, and the principles upon which these are based. He said: "Property in African negroes is not an exception to any general rule. Upon rational principles it is no more local or peculiar than any other property." And he argued that a State has the same right to declare a wife who might be brought within its limits to be "free from all obligations of that condition," as to declare the same thing of a slave.

It is to be conceded that no Court has yet made a decision in conformity with the claims here put forth, on behalf of Virginia. But can the nature and extent of the rights demanded by the South be doubted or misunderstood? And whenever a Senate with a perpetual Southern majority shall have the control of nominations for Judges of the Supreme Court, is it not morally certain that the decision, in the premises, of Judges thus selected will be in favor of Virginia's claims?

Loyal Publication Society, No. 1.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

LOYAL REPRINTS.—No. 2.

THE ECHO FROM THE ARMY.

WHAT OUR SOLDIERS SAY ABOUT THE COPPERHEADS.

NEW YORK:
WM. C. BRYANT & CO., PRINTERS, 41 NASSAU ST., COR. LIBERTY.

1863.

THE ECHO FROM THE ARMY

WHAT OUR SOLDIERS SAY ABOUT THE COPPERHEADS.

There is an old story of an Irishman who complained of the incivility of a famous echo, near the Lakes of Killarney. He shouted: "I've got ye now!" and received, somewhat to his surprise, the reply: "You lie!" The Copperheads of the Northern and Western States have come unexpectedly upon a similar experience. Their cries of treason are echoed back from the army, but the echo is a cry of loyalty, determined and often fierce, which will probably prevent them from tempting fortune in that direction again.

Some little time was needed for our gallant soldiers in the field to awaken to the consciousness that a set of men who had carefully remained at home, were conspiring, with double-dyed treachery, to sell them to the enemy. But now they are awake, and from every direction, from every army, responses come which show that our soldiers are loyal to the core, and not only loyal, but confident in their power to beat both the enemy in their front and the enemy in their rear. In whatever State the copperheads have been at work, from the soldiers of that State come up words of rebuke to sneaking traitors at home, words of devotion to the Union and to lawful liberty. And as in Illinois, Indiana and Ohio these copperheads have been most loud-voiced and active, so from the soldiers of these States we have the most abundant demonstrations of courage and fidelity to our Government.

General Rosecrans, bravest and best, no politician, but a quiet, unostentatious soldier, wrote to the Ohio legislature a letter which Washington might have written in the Revolution. He says:

"I am amazed that any one can think of peace on any terms. He who entertains this sentiment is fit only to be a slave; he who utters it at this time, is, moreover, a traitor to his country, who deserves the scorn and contempt of all honorable men."

The officers of Ohio regiments in Rosecrans' army had a meeting on the 12th, and adopted a strong address and resolutions against the treasonable peace movement of the copperhead politicians. The resolutions were universally and enthusiastically approved by the Ohio regiments. They say:

"If some miserable demagogues among you must vomit forth their treason, let them keep it at home. We want none of their vile letters, speeches, or papers here. The Army of the West is in terrible earnest. Earnest to conquer and destroy armed rebels. Earnest to meet force with force. Earnest in its hearty detestation of cowardly traitors at home. Earnest in will and power to overcome all who desire the nation's ruin. Ohio's one hundred thousand soldiers in the field, citizens at home, potent in either capacity, ask their fathers, brothers, and friends by their firesides and in their peaceful homes to hear and heed this appeal, and to put an end to covert treason at home, more dangerous now to our material existence than the presence of armed hosts of misguided rebels at home."

A correspondent on the ground writes:

"The cheers with which the address was received by the Ohio regiments would have sent a thrill of joy to the heart of every loyal man in the country."

The officers of the One Hundred and Sixteenth Ohio Volunteers held a meeting at Romney, Virginia, on the 10th, in which they resolved:

"That we will hail with feelings of delight the dawnings of peace; but we can think of no peace worth having short of crushing out the rebellion, and the complete restoration of the authority of the Government over every foot of her soil, East, West, North, and South.

"That nothing but an unconditional surrender on the part of the rebels will answer the demand of the true soldier and patriot.

"That we regard the efforts of the copperheads of Ohio to demoralize the army by writing treasonable letters to the soldiers in the field, by urging them to desert their flag, by misrepresenting the Administration and the objects of the war, and by all the means conceived only by traitors, as unworthy American citizens, and more dangerous and heinous than the efforts of armed rebels who meet us in deadly conflict on the battle-field.

"That we will cause to be remembered those cowardly grumblers and traitors, craven spirits, who, instead of aiding us in our noble purpose by their presence in the ranks, are at home aiding and abetting rebels by keeping up a fire in our rear."

"Soldiers of the Fifteenth Corps" write to the Cincinnati *Commercial*, from before Vicksburg:

"We didn't take an oath to fight against traitors in the South alone. No! And we will willingly shoot down traitors in the North, whenever they go too far in their wicked schemes. They have gone far enough now, and their infernal design against our dear Union must be crushed. They may talk about the federal army being tired of war, but they talk about a lie so base that *soldiers* do not notice it. We are in the army, and will remain in it until the American Union rests in peace, triumphant over the rebellious States, and traitors hanged, whether North or South."

Col. Leggett, of the Seventy-eighth Ohio, a bitter democrat, writes:

"I entered the military service to aid in restoring and sustaining the integrity and unity of my Government. For that object I have fought and bled, and for that I am still willing to fight and bleed, and no blunder or mistakes upon the part of the President can justify me in withdrawing from the army, while the enemies of the Government are in arms against it."

From Indiana soldiers, too, there is a cry against Indiana copperheads.

General Milroy (democrat) and his staff write to Indianapolis:

"Any man or set of men, who, in times like these, when our Government is engaged in a deadly struggle for its existence—a struggle which involves not only the fate of free government in our own country, but for all the world—would attempt to disgrace and prostitute the name of democrat by organizing a party under that name to oppose the Government, and divide and distract the people of the loyal States, are traitors much meaner than those in arms who boldly and directly seek the destruction of the Government, for these prtended democrats sneakingly and indirectly seek the same end by exciting prejudice against the Government, and division among the people."

General Hovey and his Indiana Colonels stationed at Helena, Arkansas, have issued an address to the democrats of Indiana, warning them against showing favor to the peace plots of schemers. They express themselves with soldierly indignation:

"What! admit that we are whipped? That twenty-three millions of northern men are unequal to nine millions of the South? Shame on the State that would entertain so disgraceful a proposition! Shame upon the democrat who would submit to it, and raise his cowardly voice, and claim that he was an Indianian! In this dark hour of our country's trial there is but one road to success and peace, and that is, to be as firmly united for our Government as the rebels are against it. Small differences of opinion amount to nothing in this grand struggle for a nation's existence. Do not place even one straw in the way, and remember that every word you speak to encourage the South nerves the arm that strikes the blow which is aimed at the heart's blood of our brothers and kindred."

They tell their fellow-citizens that

"The rebels of the South are leaning on the northern democracy for support, and it is unquestionably true that unjustifiable opposition to the Administration is giving aid and comfort to 'the enemy.'"

They say:

"The name of democrat, associated with all that is bright and glorious in the history of the past, is being sullied and disgraced by demagogues who are appealing to the lowest prejudices and passions of our people. We have nothing to expect from the South, and nothing to hope without their conquest. They are now using their money freely to subsidize the press and politicians of the North, and with what effect the tone of some of our journals and the speeches of some of our leaders testify."

And they add:

"Indiana's proud and loyal legions number at least seventy thousand effective men in the field, and with one great heart we know that they would repudiate all unholy combinations tending to the dismemberment of our Government."

A soldier writes to the Chicago *Tribune*, from the battle-field of Murfreesboro':

"What else was the *animus* of the Indiana resolutions than a mockery of the memory of the Indiana dead?

"The first greetings to our great but dearly bought victory at Murfreesboro' were cowardly

cries for 'peace.' While we were gathering together the mutilated bodies of our brave boys, and tenderly placing them in rude fashioned graves in the field where they nobly fell, members of a legislative body in the North were resolving an epitaph for their State's fallen braves, and the sum of their resolving might truthfully be read thus:

"Here Lies a Fellow,
Whose Mistaken Zeal for his Country's Integrity and Honor
Caused him to Unconstitutionally Slay
Our Dear Down-trodden Southern Brethren, in an Unholy Cause."

A formal address of "The Soldiers of Indiana to the Citizens of Indiana" says:

"We expect to come home some day. We will either come triumphantly rejoicing over the accomplishment of the object for which we have already endured so much, or we will come humiliated and disheartened at our defeat, and the consequent desolation of our country and our homes. In either event we will remember and honor those who have aided and encouraged us by their influence at home, and will visit those who have sought to defeat us with a retribution proportionate to the extent of the evil they have brought upon us and our country."

Colonel C. L. Dunham, commanding the Second Indiana Brigade, writes from Jackson, Tenn., 4th inst., to Governor Morton:

"Vigorous measures must be adopted, or our army, under the influence of the scoundrels and traitors at home who are, by their letters, scattering discontent among our soldiers, will be demoralized and destroyed, and the scourge of this war will, in less than six months, be rolled back upon the fair fields of our glorious Northwest.

"These men know not what they do, and if they expect any general sympathy in the army, they are reckoning without their host."

It is, however, in Illinois, that the copperheads have been busiest in their work of treachery, and it is accordingly from Illinois soldiers that we have the most abundant testimony of unflinching loyalty and determination. Thus, on the 30th of January, a meeting of Illinois officers was called at Corinth, and adopted "resolutions to show to Governor Yates and the other State officers of Illinois, and to all our friends at home, that we are still in favor of the vigorous prosecution of the war, and that we will uphold our President and Governor in all their efforts to put down this rebellion."

The third resolution reads thus:

"*Resolved*, That we have watched the traitorous conduct of those members of the legislature of the state of Illinois, who, misrepresenting their constituency, have been proposing a cessation of the war, avowedly to arrange terms of peace, but really to give time for the exhausted rebels to recover strength and renew their plotting to divest Governor Yates of the rights and authority vested in him by our State constitution and laws; and to them we calmly and firmly say: *Beware of the terrible retribution that is falling upon your coadjutors at the South, and that as your crime is tenfold blacker, it will swiftly smite you with tenfold more horror, should you persist in your damnable deeds of treason.*"

And the fifth reads thus:

"*Resolved*, That we hold in detestation and will ever execrate any man who, in this struggle for our national life, offers factious opposition to either the federal or state authorities, in their efforts or measures for the vigorous prosecution of the war for the suppression of this godless rebellion."

On motion, it was decided to have a copy of the resolutions sent to the commanding officer of each Illinois regiment in the district, to be read at dress parade, and to be voted upon by the men of each regiment.

Certificates from the commanding officers of the Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Twelfth, Fiftieth, Fifty-second, Fifty-seventh, Sixty-second, and Sixty-sixth Illinois regiments show that the resolutions were thus read and unanimously adopted by the men.

At a meeting of the officers of the Sixty-second Illinois regiment, Colonel James M. True in the chair, this resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That we denounce the wickedness and baseness of those citizens of the North who, by disloyal speeches and otherwise, impart confidence and hope to rebels in arms against their Government; who encourage Union soldiers to desert, and threaten armed resistance to their recovery; and who, by letters, speeches, or acts, endeavor to promote disaffection in the army, the last hope of the nation; that we appeal to our fathers, our brothers, and our friends at home, to discountenance, oppose, and put down those base and infamous wretches, who, while breathing the free air of Illinois, sympathize with treason and denounce the government which has given them peace and security, with liberty, from their childhood, now struggling almost in a death agony, and who, from motives of ambition, or for their own personal aggrandizement or advantage, would lend their aid, however indirectly, to reduce Illinois to the unhappy situation of the rebel south

ern states, the seat of blighting and desolating war."

At another meeting of Illinois troops, a series of resolutions were adopted, of which this is one:

"*Resolved*, That we hereby proclaim to the world our undying love of the Union of States, and, at the same time, our eternal and everlasting abhorrence for traitors, whether found in armed rebellion at the South, or in disloyal conventions and legislatures North."

From the Forty-sixth Illinois regiment, stationed at Moscow, Tennessee, comes the following, in a letter to the Dixon (Illinois) *Telegraph*, dated January 29:

"We hate those villains and traitors who are afraid that the rebels will be hurt or deprived of their property, and would rather shoot them than southern traitors. We are surprised that men should be allowed to put forth such resolutions as those lately passed in Springfield, and if the black-hearted cowards who put them forth think they have friends in the army, they are sadly deceived. Dark and dispiriting as the future looks, we are still ready to fight traitors; and when those in the South are put down, we want a chance at those detestable and cowardly ones in the North. General Grant's army was never in better fighting trim than at present, and if the traitors of Illinois will come down here, it will do its utmost to exterminate them with their brother rebels."

The Thirteenth Illinois, from their camp in the field before Vicksburg, sent a bugle blast against the peace traitors at home, under date of February 10th. They specifically range themselves on the side of the President, though they say many of them opposed his election, and they add:

"That we firmly and cordially endorse the President's Proclamation emancipating the slaves of rebels, thereby depriving them of one of their greatest elements of strength, and we will, to the best of our ability, aid in the execution and enforcement of the same.

"That any person or newspaper uttering or publishing opinions that the army of Illinois, in the field, are anxious to quit the service and return to their homes on account of the policy of the President, utter his or their own sentiments, which we consider disloyal, and a libel upon the feelings of the army.

"That we are unconditionally opposed to any armistice or convention having for its object any compromise or settlement of the difficulties now existing between the United States and the traitors in arms, except on unconditional submission to the laws which they have without cause so wickedly violated."

The following was adopted unanimously (except one vote) and enthusiastically by Col. Niles's regiment, the One Hundred and Thirtieth Illinois, at Fort Pickering, Memphis, on the 11th of February:

"*Resolved*, That we, soldiers of Illinois, in arms in the face of the enemy, have nothing now to do with politics, or political discussions, nor any desire to mingle in them; we wish and intend to do our duty as soldiers. With the policy of the Administration and its head, Abraham Lincoln, our Commander-in-Chief, we have nothing to do. Our oaths bind us to obey his orders and the orders of the officers appointed over us, and to bear true allegiance to the United States. Our oaths we will keep, so help us God! But while we deny not the right and duty of political discussion to those who have the time and opportunity therefor, we protest with all the energy and vehemence of our natures, and with all the patriotism of our hearts we inveigh and protest against surrender or retreat, and against any armistice, or truce, or peace, or compromise, with traitors in arms; and we here solemnly resolve that we will hold that man as a traitor and an eternal enemy to us, to our children, and to our country, who shall propose, or has proposed, any settlement by which the rebellion shall be screened from just punishment, and the country and her defenders cheated of the fruits of past victories and present triumph. Our labors, blood, and treasures shall not be spent in vain."

General John A. Logan, of Illinois, a democrat of the straitest sect, when he heard of the action of the Illinois Legislature, wrote:

"Tell them up North for me that we can whip the rebels, and are going to do it; and when we are done, we are to return home. When we get there we shall yet be strong enough to summarily punish any secession sympathizers, or peace preachers that we may be able to find in our way."

Colonel Frank Sherman wrote on the 14th instant, from the Camp on Stone river, Tennessee:

"Let the disunionists of the North take heed. We do not propose quietly to allow them to trample on our rights, and help to dig our graves. What we expect and look for is that men will not long be allowed to utter traitors' sentiments at our homes; that there is true patriotism enough left to save the country, and rub out traitors of all degrees at home, in the guise of loyalty, to whatever party they may belong. Every officer and soldier that I have talked with in regard to our duty, agrees with me; that we will sustain, to the death, our Commander-in-Chief, the Presi-

dent of the United States, in all measures and orders that he may issue for the crushing of the rebellion in the southern states."

"G. H., Co. A, 2d Illinois Cavalry," writes from Memphis, February 7th, about the copperheads:

"I say that all such men ought to be made to leave the country or be hung. This is the way the southerners do, even with harmless Union men in the South, and sure our cause is much more valuable than theirs. I say as General Hurlbut said in his late speech, 'that the copperheads create a very bad influence on our glorious army.' I say they ought, at least, to be made to hold their tongues, even if it cost a 'free fight' in the North. I think that a great injustice was done when the army was not allowed to vote in the different elections since the commencement of this war. Through this the traitors of the North are daily venturing to show themselves."

An officer in General Rosecrans' army, says:

"Woe betide the secession sympathizers and would-be peacemakers when the army get through with their present work on hand. The sufferings, deprivations, and hardships of soldier-life, are not so easily endured, and the cause we are fighting for is too dear to be broken down by the cowards and stay-at-homes who brought on the war, and now place every impediment in the way of having accomplished what must be the inevitable result—the subjugation of the rebellion. Curses loud and deep go out every day from men and officers, and they are not to be lightly thought of. Now and then you can hear the names of some marked men, whose life or lives are pledged for a rope or bullet. All in good time and they will get them."

Of the feeling in the army of General Rosecrans, a correspondent of the St. Louis *Democrat* writes:

"I have made it my business to talk with and find out the general sentiment of the army in regard to this new phase of disloyalty, and on no subject have I found the whole army so unanimous as in their bitter denunciation of such traitors as Goudy and Merrick, and the rest of the party that organized that traitorous meeting in the very capital of the State which has sent its hundred and fifty thousand men to fight the battles of the government. Officers and men denounce them alike. I have heard hundreds of men say that the war on secessionists was not (with them) confined to the South; that here they had acquired the habit of destroying the property and taking the lives of traitors, and that they did not think they could leave off the habit when they got home."

In Leavenworth, Kansas, the brave General Blunt made a speech on the 14th inst., in which he said:

"Fellow-citizens: I have some little respect for a man who believes his cause to be just, and who fights to sustain it. But the most detestable men on earth are the consummate cowards who lack the courage to shoulder the musket and go inside the rebel lines, but who stay at home and fire in the rear of the men who are defending your homes and your country.

"I have yet to see the first soldier who is tired of this war, or disposed to end it without the unconditional submission of the rebels. [Applause.] The men are all right, and they are not at all fastidious about having the nigger to help them. Wherever I have heard any objection to rebels being killed by negroes, I have always noticed that it came from some fool in shoulder-straps."

And no sooner is a copperhead nominated for Governor in Connecticut t' an Connecticut soldiers begin to speak out.

A letter from Colonel William G. Ely, of the Eighteenth Connecticut regiment, denounces the copperheads of his native State.

"I am surprised that the people of Connecticut are becoming contaminated with the fickle and cowardly spirit now manifested in various sections. Let the people of the North shrink from the contest in which we are now engaged, and bitter will be their disappointment.

"In place of thanks from the thousands of soldiers now in the field, for the withdrawal of their support to this war, the curses of the brave will ring in their ears, demanding: Why do you insult us by doubting our ability? What revenge have we for our comrades slain?"

The following extract from a private letter written by a member of company H, Twelfth Connecticut regiment, to a friend in Collinsville, puts the matter in its true light:

"Have you any secesh scamps among you who are prating of compromise? If you have, do, for God's sake, give them a rifle, and turn them over to Jeff. Davis, for they cannot then do the harm they are doing now. There is no one who desires peace more than I do, but as long as the rebels are in arms, and as long as any flag other than the stars and stripes waves in this country, I say fight them!"

LOYAL REPRINTS.—No. 3.

THE GREAT MASS MEETING OF LOYAL CITIZENS, AT COOPER INSTITUTE, FRIDAY EVENING, MARCH 6, 1863.

Of this meeting, the New York *Tribune* said:

"The army of men which occupied the Cooper Building and the surrounding squares last evening, attested the loyalty of the heart of the Union. An hour before the time of meeting, the hall was more than filled, and ingress became nearly impossible. The tide of patriotism swelled and swayed in the aisles, the lobbies, on the staircases, and back far into the street. Soon the urging spirit of patriotism began to manifest itself within. The platform, early in the evening, began to be illustrated by some of the oldest and noblest of our citizens, and the harmonious strains of the band soon failed to satisfy the overflowing spirits of the vast assemblage."

The *Herald* said:

"The largest and most enthusiastic war meeting ever held in this city since the memorable open-air gathering at Union square, in 1861, took place at the Cooper Institute last evening. The meeting was called for eight o'clock, but long before seven the large hall of the Institute was besieged on every side by citizens of every rank and condition in life. To say that the building was crowded to repletion, is to convey a very inadequate idea of the numberless numbers that were packed within its walls. Such unity of feeling and warm outspoken enthusiasm for the vigorous prosecution of the war against the rebellion, have rarely been seen at any loyal and patriotic gathering.

"The attention of the audience was attracted to a venerable old gentleman, with a bald head and long silvery locks, sitting near the platform. After a little while the old gentleman took a position upon the platform among others, when he was cheered.

"Gen. Prosper M. Wetmore came forward, and said: 'You do well to cheer this venerable old man, for he is an old soldier who fought for his country fifty years ago, and his name is Gen. Swift.' [Loud cheers.]

"Soon after this, Gen. Wetmore introduced to the audience Major-Gen. Couch, commanding the Second Army Corps, now at Fredericksburg, who was vehemently cheered.

"Again Gen. W. announced another soldier, in the person of a boy You will remember, said Gen. W., that at the battle of Fredericksburg 100 men volunteered to cross the river and spike the guns of the enemy. This boy insisted upon going with them, but was told that he was too small. When the boat shoved off he hung on to the stern of the boat, and went over in the water. [Applause.] While on the other side he picked off a rebel, got his gun, and brought it over. [Applause.] Gen. Burnside praised him in the face of the army. He is a drummer-boy, and has got his drum here. It was presented to him to-day for his gallantry. His name is Robert Henry Hendershot, and he shot a rebel. [Applause.] He belongs to the Eighth Michigan Infantry.

He will now beat a tune for you. [Cheers.] The boy then came forward and beat a tattoo on his drum in a truly artistic style, very much to the gratification of the audience, who cheered him loudly."

The chief speakers at this meeting were James T. Brady, Judge Daly, and John Van Buren. The latter entered into a strong historical defence of the lately passed Conscription act, showing that during when last war threatened with Great Britain, a Democratic Congress placed the same powers in the hands of a Democratic President, and received therefor the general approval of the whole country.

The following were the officers of the meeting. Mayor Opdyke presided, in the absence of Gen. Scott:

Vice-Presidents.—George Opdyke, [cheers,] Pelatiah Perit, Luther Bradish, A. A. Low, [loud cheering,] Francis B. Cutting, Royal Phelps, Alex. T. Stewart, James Lenox, Charles H. Marshall, Wm. F. Havemeyer, Jonathan Sturges, C. R. Robert, Moses Taylor, John A. Stevens, John D. Wolf, Benj. L. Swan, Edwards Pierrepont, G. C. Verplanck, Benj. R. Winthrop, Denning Duer, Marshall O. Roberts, Samuel E. Low, F. S. Winston, William G. Lambert, Isaac Bell, Nehemiah Knight, Wm. E. Dodge, Francis Lieber, Richard D. Lathrop, Moses H. Grinnell, Ezra Nye, W. W. De Forest, Henry K. Bogert, George T. Elliott, Samuel Wetmore, Henry G. Stebbins, James G. King, Robert L. Kennedy, James L. White, George Griswold, Stephen Cambreleng, Hiram Barney, Benjamin W. Bonney, Samuel T. Skidmore, H. W. T. Mali, Wm. C. Gilman, Abram Wakeman, Shepard Gandy, Robert Bayard, E. C. Cowdin, George S. Coe, George Irving, Cyrus W. Field, Daniel Drew, John Jay White, Edwin Hoyt, Frederic Depeyster, Hugo Wesendonck, A. J. Bleecker, Geo. W. Blunt, Adam W. Spies, Jeremiah Burns, Seth B. Hunt, James W. Beekman, W. C. H. Waddell, George Bisbee, James B. Nicholson, D. Van Nostrand, Ferdinand Lawrence, Frederick A. Conkling, Benj. H. Field, Abraham R. Van Nest, Elijah Fisher, Pierre Humbert, James K. Pell, Jacob S. Westervelt, A. C. Kingsland, John Ewen, T. Weed, John B. Borst, Geo. Denison, Courtland Palmer, Wm. Mitchell, Lewis B. Woodruff, Edw. P. Cowles, Murray Hoffman, John Slosson, John D. Townsend, Augustus Schell, Nathaniel Jarvis, Jr., Wm. A. Darling, George H. Moore, John E. Develin, Wm. B. Taylor, Erastus Goodwin, Aaron Vanderpoel, J. A. Pullen, H. Blake, W. C. Wetmore, Wm. Curtis Noyes, Wm. H. Fogg, George P. Nelson, Jos. W. Patterson, Lorenzo Sherwood, Luther B. Wyman, Josiah S. Bennett, John Chadwick, John A. King, Hamilton Fish, Wm. B. Astor, George Bancroft, John J. Cisco, Charles King, William Whitlock, Jr., Charles H. Russell, J. J. Phelps, Morris Ketchum, John C. Green, Shepherd Knapp, Robert L. Stuart, Joseph Lawrence, George S. Robbins, Wm. M. Evarts, Samuel Sloan, Wm. V. Brady, James Boorman, R. H. McCurdy, John Jacob Astor, Jr., Peter Cooper, Simeon Draper, John Wadsworth, Charles Gould, E. E. Morgan, Augustus C. Richards, George F. Nesbit, William Orton, George Cabot Ward, O. D. F. Grant, S. B. Chittenden, Andrew Carrigan, B. H. Hutton, E. Delafield Smith, Robert T. Haws, George T. Adee, Joseph Ripley, James Benkard, William Barton, James B. Murray, Morris Franklin, R. A. Whitthaus, Samuel B. Ruggles, Henry H. Elliott, Mathew T. Brennan, George T. Strong, E. D. Stanton, Floyd Smith, C. Astor Bristed, Charles Butler, Nathaniel Hayden, William F. Blodgett, George F. Talman, Samuel Blatchford, B. F. Manniere, S. Kauffman, Rufus F. Andrews, Frank E. Howe, Wm. M. Vermilyea, Charles W. Sandford, James R. Whiting, Henry B Stanton, A. M. White, James F. Depeyster, William T. Coleman, Charles B. Spicer, Erastus C. Benedict, Lloyd Aspinwall, Abraham M. Cozzens, Michael Ulshoeffer, Thomas C. Smith, Wm. H. Aspinwall, Townsend Harris, Charles Yates, Thos. C. Acton, John McKesson, Joseph Lee, Samuel Beman, William H. Webb, Cornelius Vanderbilt, Wilson G. Hunt, Henry A. Heiser, J. R. Livington, P. S. Forbes, Leonard W. Jerome, Henry O. Reilly, John A. Lott, Waldo Hutchings, Henry E. Davies, George Law, T. G. Churchill, Marshall Lefferts, H. A. Smythe, Philip Tillinghast, Horace B. Claflin, Wm. H. Mellen, James Low, Charles Anthony, Charles Roome, S. Hutchinson, George B. Butler, John Slade, Wm. W. Stone, Wm. W. Budd, Floyd Bailey, S. D. W. Bloodgood, Alfred G. Benson, Sinclair Tousey, C. E. Detmold, Benjamin C. Thayer.

Secretaries.—Wm. Allen Butler, Charles E. Strong, John Austin Stevens, Jr., Edward C. Bogert, W. H. L. Barnes, Edward King, John H. Draper, A. M. Palmer, Richard A. McCurdy, Wm. L. Ellsworth, Nathaniel W. Burtis, John H. Almy, Ethan Allen, Frank W. Ballard, Wm. P. Lee, R. J. Vanderburgh, Andrew Warner, Wm. S. Opdyke, Theodore Tilton, Charles H. Ludding-ton, John Ordronaux, Cephas Brainard, Edward, A. Wetmore, John Heckscher, Charles S. Spencer, Frederick G. Swan, Wm. O. Bourne, Frank Moore, Spencer Kirby, George Ward Nichols, Chas. T Evans.

SPEECH OF JAMES T. BRADY.

The United States of America. [Loud cheers.] This is my country. I can admit of no other

There is no name to be substituted for that. There is no flag except ours that I can ever accept [cheers], no star to be taken out of it [cheers], no stripe to be stolen from it [cheers]; stars to be added to it without number [cheers], stripes to be accumulated till the eye tires of looking at them; so that, with all the gallant history of its past, and glorious associations of its present, however gloomy the prospect may appear to many, there shall be for us, now, and hereafter, one country, one constitution, one destiny. [Loud cheers.] I was dining with a friend to-day, who read to me an extract from a newspaper—the *Express*—[laughter, and expression of disfavor]—saying that this was a meeting of abolitionists, and that Brady would not be present. I am not certain that I am, for there is so much of individuality and spiritual power and tendency to great results, in this chamber, charged with patriotism, that I am like nothing in this majestic presence. [Applause.] But so far as I am capable of knowing myself, I am here—here with delight—here with pride. [Applause.] Although from the first time that I ever made a speech in public till now, most of you have been opposed to me, as I well understand, in political sentiment, I thank God that it has been permitted me to be present on an occasion when any one human being would attach importance to my voice in saying that I stand up now, as I always have done, for the preservation of the Union and the Constitution of the country. [Loud cheers.] When I began life I heard, as I afterward heard, a word called Yankee. It certainly does not apply to me; but the South has applied that word to all of us at the North. Now, I am free to say that I discover in the Yankee character some particular features that I no more admire than I do some of the prominent traits in the inhabitants of the land from which I sprang. But I nevertheless accept the name of Yankee as applied to me in the spirit of our forefathers in the revolutionary period, and if the South can find no more of disgrace to be attached to it than its undying struggle for the preservation of this Government, whether slavery exists or falls, I thank God for it. [Loud applause.] You will pardon me, my fellow-citizens, if I offend the prejudices of some of you in speaking my mind. The first speech I ever made for a Presidential candidate was in behalf of a Southern man. From that time to this my sympathies have been strongly with that portion of the Union. But, gentlemen, to make the matter pointed, if I lived in a house with a friend, and he announced to me, some day, that under no circumstances would he associate with me any longer, I would propose to vindicate what is manly in my nature by telling him that I would go somewhere where I could find suitable company. [Great merriment and applause.] And when I came here to-night, and as I passed through the streets to-day, I was beset by gentlemen for whom I have the greatest respect, who wondered whether I would speak at a meeting where gentlemen always opposed to us in politics would be present, and where perhaps a spirit of freedom stronger than any that had entered into their natures might be exhibited. [Applause.] Gentlemen, I differ with many of you in regard to the causes, the conduct, the prosecution, and the probable results of the war in which we are engaged. But, with the blessing of Heaven, whoever may applaud, and whoever may censure, I would be false to the Irish race, from which I sprung, to find here a home and a refuge from the persecution and oppression of that detested land to which the first speaker too politely referred [applause and a hiss], if I did not use my last breath, and employ the last quiver of my lips, in the utterance of a prayer to Heaven against all assailants, internal and external, for the preservation of the American Government. [Loud applause.] When this war broke out, I knew that it was urged on by the South. I hoped that it might terminate early; I hoped that my Southern countrymen—for such they are—would develop among them some desire to remain with us. I detected with regret that they had prepared means to make an assault upon a Union that they ought to love. I maintained silence in regard to it. You will excuse my egotism, but I now justify myself in my own presence. I found that they proposed to take to themselves Fort Sumter, the forts at Key West and Pensacola, Tortugas, and Fortress Monroe. I thought it was quite essential to the dignity and prosperity of the country

that we should retain these fortresses. I think so now. I did hope, however, that the Southern people would put their feet upon the necks of their leaders, and insist upon the maintenance of the Union. But they have informed us that they would consent to no such condition. They have told us that if we gave them a blank paper and pencil to write the terms of a new compact, they would not agree to it. Therefore, it is a war declared for all ultimate results that can come, and I spit upon the Northern man who takes any position except for the maintenance of the Government. [Here almost the entire audience rose to their feet, waved their hats, and cheered vociferously for some moments.] I surrender here all opinions that may sway a Presidential contest. I surrender all inquiry as to who shall be Governor of any State. I give up all inquiry as to who shall be Mayor of the city of New York—although I have no great objection to my friend the President of the meeting, for whom I did not vote. [Laughter.] I stand here in the presence of the assembled multitudes of the past. I feel glowing within me what may have animated the heart of the Egyptian, when, chained to one of the great stones that was to form part of the magnificent pyramid to illustrate the majestic powers of the crumbling mortal who was to perish within them, he felt that the time would come when there should be a government of freedom in the world. I have within me the hope of the poor serf in Russia, the enthusiasm of the young Hungarian, who, by the little flicking flame of freedom, even though it be in a dungeon, finds himself stimulated with the hope that he may once see a land beyond the deep, not revealed, perhaps, even to a Moses from Mount Pisgah, where a free people have established a free Government. And in the name of Almighty God, I invoke such curses as He may permit, innocuous as mine may be, to put an end to any man who would destroy a structure like that. [Loud applause.] Are there such men? There are. Let me allude to them in classes. [A voice—"Brooks."]

> Books in the running brooks, sermons in stones,
> And good in everything. [Laughter.]

I propose to indulge in no personalities; they are not to my taste. I propose to deal in general principles. Now, if my Irish friend be anywhere within the sound of my voice, he knows what is moving in this frame of mine, the son of an Irish father, who migrated in hot-haste, and was chased into the port of New York, his highest ambition being that his son might be born in America. [Great merriment.] Some of my fellow-citizens of New York, and some of my friends with whom I quite agree about the absence of any necessity to violate the Constitution in the matter of arrests, or otherwise, undertake to talk to me about freedom of speech being suppressed. I would like to know when the time was in the history of this country, for the last twenty years, that I could have dared to say in the city of Charleston what a Southerner could say with impunity in this town? [Loud applause.] My friends from Massachusetts must pardon me when I say that for many years they have offended my Celtic prejudices by informining me that we were all of the Anglo-Saxon race. I wish to be understood in regard to that, as the boys say about New York, that "I don't see it" [laughter], for certainly none of those from whom I sprung have any connection with that particular department of human distribution. [Laughter.] A distinguished representative of the United States at the Court of St. James told them that the people of this country felt more interest in the prosperity of London than of New York. I will not mention the name—but I will say that he did not belong to this State. What offends me most is the expression of those Englishmen on our territory who dare, in their customary aping of the language and deportment of their superiors, to cavil about the arms and progress of the country in which they find a place so far superior to any they could be permitted to enjoy in their own land. [Applause.] They are invited to clubs by gentlemen, and they lie about them in saying that they throw dice for drink, where dice never were known. They are spies, and pimps, and eavesdroppers, who are admitted to circles of private society, and go out and write letters saying there was one thing wanting. And so there was—a sturdy servant to kick the inquisitive vagabond into the street. [Laughter and applause.] They hang around the purlieus of our towns and drink their ale—

which they very seldom pay for themselves—and then turn up their snub noses and open their ugly mouths to abuse a country in which they are entertained. [Applause.] We are a patient people, but I hope to God that the last illustration of that kind imported to this country will prove that the goods are not credited to this market, and we do not mean to have Englishmen insult us under any circumstances whatever. [Applause.]

I will differ with the majority here, in reference to one thing. Great apprehensions are entertained lest England should interfere. I have prayed to God, on my bended knees, that she would. [Loud applause.] Let her but exhibit one single manifestation in that direction, and there is not a man of my race that would talk about the exemption of 45 years of age. [Great laughter.] He would hobble up on his crutch, in the ardent expectation of splitting the head of any one who undertook to interfere in a matter that belongs to ourselves. Permit me, however, to do justice to those wise, excellent, and patriotic gentlemen of England who have been so just toward us throughout this controversy. I would disgrace myself, and insult you, if I did not acknowledge here my gratitude to those who, without fear or hope of reward, have stood by our cause. I would do myself injustice if I did not admire the character of that great man, John Bright [loud applause], whose last observation in regard to *The London Herald* and *Standard* is, that he does not care much about their censure, for neither of them, in the markets of England, could affect the price of a pinch of snuff. [Laughter and applause.] The single reason, as you all know, why France and England desire to interfere in this fight is an acknowledgment, in the presence of the world, that they are indebted to us for the means of employing and supporting their population. [Applause.] One hundred thousand men in Lancashire maintained by public charity when I last spoke to an audience assembled! One hundred thousand men! Which led me to make the proposition, to which I challenge any contradiction, that wild and fierce and blind as the rebels are, each division of the Union in its armed presentation, is greater than the power of England! [Applause.] I was happy to discover that what fell from lips so obscure as mine provoked a whole editorial column from a Manchester paper. They said that no American could have uttered a sentiment of that kind, and they recognized in the name of Brady one of those Irish Anglo-Phobian Papists who have been controlling the doctrines of this country. [Laughter.] I think if that editor was here he would hardly suppose that I had religion enough to control anybody; or if I had, that it would control such an assemblage as this. [Laughter.]

Now, fellow-citizens, I am met everywhere, as you are, by the question, How is this thing to end? I am sorry to say that the presupposed answer to that question is interfered with by two classes of men. First, by the women of this country. Bachelor as I am, no doubt this remark will subject me to censure. But I say if the women of the North had manifested that interest which they should in the success of our cause, which the women of the South have done in theirs, thousands more of men would have been stimulated to take their position in the field. I can never find myself *en rapport* with that class of people who manifest something like pleasure at the success of our foe. What is this war about? It certainly has grown into a war; it certainly is a war of the North against the South. And when I talked with Southerners, as I did with three in Philadelphia last Sunday, as ardent Secessionists and as bitter opponents as I can find anywhere—as bitter as those who cluster in presence of Jefferson Davis himself—I said, "Gentlemen, you must admit that there is a moral superiority in the people with whom I am associated, when you can talk to me freely what I would not dare to say at the South, except at the peril of my existence." [Applause.] And I said to them, say to you: How is this thing to end? I say, with your permission, gentlemen, to my friends of the Democratic party, whom I cannot meet one by one on the street, and who perhaps would not value my opinion if I did—Sir, how do you propose to end it? The South say to you, "You are all Yankees; we propose no association with you, and will consent to none." Have you ever seen a man with a white face

upon him or a black face upon him who would pursue for the sake of society the person who spurned him?" [Cheers.] You ask me how this is to end. With the feeble powers that I have possessed since I arrived at man's estate, I have struggled for that which I would contend for if the Constitution were restored or continued, that is, every right which the South can justly claim under that sacred instrument. But they say, we will make no peace. They propose that there shall be two governmants on this soil—armed governments. Sir, I cannot consent to any such condition. ["No!"] Rome and Sparta, Carthage and Athens, were all Republics; this was taught to you in your primer. Each of them was a military power. I refer you to *The Federalist* and the articles of Alexander Hamilton, in regard to the possibility of maintaining separate organizations of government on this continent. When you can answer them, let me see your treatise or hear your discourse, and I will be submissive, as I hope I have always been, to the voice of reason. But, Mr. Southerner, listen to me and the men who have stood by the South against the denunciations of presses—and, gentlemen, I see them represented on this platform—listen to me who, with the feeble capacity that I possess, have insisted always that you should have all the rights to which you are entitled. You say no.

Mr. Lincoln was elected President, but you went into the canvass. He was chosen President, and yet there was a majority in both branches of Congress against him. *I defy you to point out a single act of the Government which should have provoked any hostility on your part.* But as long as there is breath in my body—if you make it a question between the South and the North—I should think I was unworthy of the mother who bore me if I did not go for any portion sustained by the Constitution of the United States. [Applause.] And now, gentlemen, in conclusion, I propose to answer that question to my Southern friends: What will come of this war? You say you will never consent to be united with us. We say that we will never agree to the existence of two military governments arising out of the same people on the same territory. The issue is distinct.]Cheers.] How is this to be resolved? I will tell you, gentlemen, my opinion, and yet many here, in accordance with that difference of opinion to which I have referred, will differ with me. I have said in the earlier part of my remarks that there were some qualities of the New England character which did not commend themselves closely to my special regard. At the same time, you will permit me to say that the most disinterested acts of friendship which I have ever received have been from people opposed to me in political sentiment. [Uproar near the door. "Go on!" "Go on!"] Oh, I will go on. That is no more than one single raid of a small lot of rebels. [Cheers and laughter.]

My opinion is founded upon this. I remember on an occasion when we celebrated St. Patrick's Day—a circumstance to which I never had any special objection, as when we made punch for others and Judys of ourselves, and still grew warm in the glow of social intercourse—General Shields [cheers] made this remark—that wherever the Yankee located a blacksmith shop, a tavern, or a school-house, he never was known to secede from it. [Cheers.] Can you remember any instance to the contrary? Why, half-way between Cairo and Suez, on the Grand Desert, a Yankee opened a house to introduce the travelers of that region to an institution called buckwheat flour slap-jacks [laughter], had them cooked to a nicety by a regular and monotonous tick of a Yankee clock. [Laughter and cheers.] And if we have come to the position called the falling-off place, we shall find a Yankee there sitting on the brink, with his legs hanging over, and looking off and sighing, not like Alexander, for new worlds to conquer, but that this world is so small. [Applause.] Now, I tell my Southern brethren that their only chance is to let the Constitution be their guide, for if these Yankees once get down into that Southern territory, who have a theory about this war, and put arms into the hands of the negroes [loud cheering], and put up their long feet on the tables of the estates of which they take possession, I don't want to be the lawyer in an action of ejectment. [Great laughter and applause.] *I sincerely believe that unless the gentlemen of the South will manifest some lingering remnant of attachment to the Union, and agree*

that the Constitution of the United States shall preserve us as one people in the territory that we occupy, the end of this war will be occupation; and Mr. Eli Thayer, whom I have never had the pleasure of seeing, in advance of me has illustrated the fact that whenever you show any place to the Yankee to go to, he goes there, and when he goes there he stays there, and when they propose to remove him, they find it exceedingly difficult. [Cheers.]

You will pardon me for relating an anecdote. A man in a hotel in New Orleans heard his friend in the next room, who was subject to night-mare, making a fearful noise. He went in and said, "Why, you are in a dreadful State?" "Why, I am frightened," answered his friend, "I have had a dreadful dream!" "Did you dream of death?" "Worse than that." "Did you dream of the devil?" "Worse than that." "Well, then, what did you dream of?" "I thought I was back in the State of Maine." [Great laughter.] That class of people can never be defeated. I am sorry to say it, I am an unwilling witness, and I hope my Teutonic friends, to whom the first speaker alluded, will excuse me when I say that neither whisky punch nor lager beer will ever overcome those iconoclasts. Before I saw the ruins of the old world, I thought I should shed a tear over them, but when I discovered that they were the stepping-stones by which the human race rose to its present height, they became a pleasant sight to me. Here civilization has found its last resting place. There is no place to which to go back; civilization knows no regurgitation—it has no refluent wave. The people of the South in the single State of Virginia would never employ the necessary physical power to redeem that exhausted soil. Nobody will say, after my discourse closes, that I have been very eulogistic to the speaker, but seriously, in the presence of my God, in the exercise of the best capacities that I know how to employ, I say to my friends of the South, however gallant and chivalric, and persevering may be their struggle in the field, all history will be false, all analogies fallacious, every promise to the human race an absurdity, if this people who have conquered the barren East and conquered the ocean, and are willing to conquer all circumstances of privation, shall not own the whole of this continent before this country expires. [Loud and continued applause.]

HON. DAVID DUDLEY FIELD'S SPEECH.

Mr. FIELD said: Mr. Chairman and fellow-citizens, it was my expectation, as it was my wish, that this meeting should be addressed chiefly by speakers whose political affinities were with parties other than that which placed this Administration in power; and such, I understand, Mr. Chairman, is the arrangement. It was thought best, however, not to leave it wholly so, but that all parties should be represented in the proceedings. There is a common ground on which we can all stand [cheers]; and that is a firm, unfaltering purpose, to put down this rebellion by force of arms [applause]; by force of arms, and I will add, by force of arms alone. [Cheers.] Other questions may be postponed and laid aside. Who got us into this war, how we got into it, and who is responsible for it;—these are questions about which my friends who have spoken, and who are to speak, and myself, may differ; but these are questions that we can settle hereafter. Now we have something else to do. [Cheers.] Then, there are questions about the manner in which this war has been heretofore conducted. They think that it should have been conducted in one way, I in another, and you, perhaps, in still another; but that question can also be settled hereafter.

The past is past, irrevocably past. We will leave it now and recur to it hereafter. To-day we stand together, agreed upon this proposition, that there is but one way to peace, and that way is through earnest, grim, victorious war. [Great applause.] Undoubtedly war is a great calamity. The destruction of property, the waste of life, are both appalling; but war is not the greatest of calamities. Servitude is a greater calamity. [Cheers.] Dishonor is a greater. [Cheers.] War is a necessity, an indispensable evil, in certain conditions of society. But the peace men, as they call themselves, ask us: "Will you war upon the homes of your Southern brethren? Will you carry carnage and desolation among your countrymen?" We are not warring to carry destruction to them or to their homes. We are war-

ring—let that be understood here and everywhere, now and always—we are warring to execute the Federal laws and to assert the supremacy of the Federal Constitution under all circumstances and at all times, and we war only upon that which stands in the way. [Cheers.] Take the case of Vicksburg, if you please. There are homes and markets and pleasant places in that town; and if it were still a peaceful town on the banks of the Father of Rivers, what Northern man would have sought to disturb it? But it is now frowning with fortresses, and hoarse with cannon, and the people of the Northwest, your friends and mine, who have bought and occupied that river, and consecrated it a perpetual highway to the sea, are not permitted to pass. The rebels have taken possession, and keep from it the smallest boat belonging to us. Then I say, this great highway shall be opened, and that river we will pass through to the sea, if we have to raze to the ground every dwelling and every market in Vicksburg. This is our right and our duty. [Applause.] But they tell us: You cannot. There are 8,000,000, they tell you, in the South, and you cannot conquer them. I answer, if there are 8,000,000, we are 23,000,000, and 23,000,000 are capable of subduing all the rebels, and will do it. They will subdue them if they drive every rebel among the eight millions into the sea. [Cheers.] But the placemen tell us—No matter, if you have the physical strength, you have not the financial ability to carry on the war. To that I answer that we have. We can carry it on not only longer than we have carried it on, but twice as long, nay, ten times as long, if need be, and maintain ourselves. [Cheers.] Why, fellow-citizens, consider our resources for a moment. The other day, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue told me that the income for the present year would be $225,000,000; and then he said to me, "Look here. Suppose the war carried on for two years longer, at the same rate of expenditure, and what will be our debt? Two thousand millions. What then? With the Union restored, at the same rate of taxation by which we now get $225,000,000, we would get $300,000,000, of which, $120,000,000 will suffice for the interest on the debt, and $100,000,000 for ordinary expenses, leaving $80,000,000 to pay towards the debt, by which it will all be paid in less than twenty years." [Cheers.] Fellow-citizens, the other day I was sitting in the Hall of the House of Representatives, looking up to the windowed ceiling, observing the escutcheons and mottoes of the different States, and thinking under what different circumstances, and with what different views the founders of States had done their work. One had an anchor and "Hope;" another the plough and "Agriculture;" another a ship, building, to signify commerce, and our own State, her proud motto "Excelsior," with the rising sun. There was one and only one appropriate to this time; it was the motto of the State of Massachusetts: *Ense petit plœidam sub libertate quietem;* with the sword she seeks under liberty peaceful rest. So are we seeking rest—peace—peaceful rest—for ourselves and our children, to the latest posterity—not under the throne, not under the miter, not under any form of tyranny, but under liberty, [cheers,] and we are seeking it, not by argument, for the day of argument is gone, but by the sword. [Applause.] The whole question is now to be resolved by the arbitrament of the sword; it is by the sword alone in Freedom's right hand that we can conquer a peace. [Loud and continued cheering.]

Ex-Judge Bonney read the following resolutions. They were received with very great applause:

Resolved, That it is the duty of every citizen to unite in all proper efforts to preserve and perpetuate the Union in accordance with the Constitution.

Resolved, That the conduct of disaffected persons claiming to be citizens of the United States, yet zealous in their attempts to embarrass and impede the action of the legally constituted authorities, and in the utterance of treasonable sentiments, deserves, and should receive the condemnation of every loyal citizen.

Resolved, That the loyal people of New York hereby pledge their fortunes, their influence, and their honor to the support of the national authority in every vigorous and determined effort by force of arms, on sea or land, to secure a complete and final suppression of the causeless and atrocious insurrection which now desolates our country.

Resolved, That the Army and Navy of the

United States owe their undivided allegiance to the Constitution they have sworn to support and defend, and that no soldier or sailor can rightfully hesitate in his obedience to the commands of superiors in rank, whose authority is derived from the government of the nation.

Resolved, That every citizen owes allegiance to the Government, and he who denies its authority, or fails in his duty to uphold the honor of its flag, is an abettor of treason, and should suffer the penalty due to his crime.

Resolved, That this meeting, under solemn convictions of duty, and in a firm reliance on the justice of that Providence which guides and guards governments and peoples, does hereby resolve itself into a Loyal League of Union Citizens, pledged to an unconditional support of the Government in all its constitutional efforts to suppress the rebellion, and an uncompromising opposition to treason in whatever form it appears.

Resolved, That the Committee of this meeting be the Officers and Committee of the LOYAL UNION LEAGUE of the citizens of New York, and that each person present is a member of the League.

The resolutions were adopted by acclamation.

JUDGE DALY'S SPEECH.

Judge DALY said: Listening, like yourselves, fellow-citizens, to the resolutions that have just been read, I find they answer a question which I rose to answer, and which was—What is the duty of Northern men, without distinction of party, in this vital crisis of the country's history? [Applause.] I feel that that question rises responsive in the minds of the large mass of human beings I look upon, and the large audience spread over the land, and awaiting the issue of the contest which is now going on. I propose in a very few words—for the hour is late and the duty is to be brief—to address myself to that question, and to do it with a sincerity which grows out of my own deep convictions, and with a wide toleration for the difference of opinion that may be entertained upon a question so momentous. [Applause.] There are a number of men in the North at present who talk of peace, who talk of an armistice, who talk of concession, who hope for compromise, and who have no hope of the war. If persons of that temper of mind have made up their minds that the war is hopeless, and that the separation of the States is now inevitable, then their conduct and their declarations are consistent with their convictions; but for men who profess, entertaining such convictions, to be desirous for the restoration of the Union, for the preservation of the land in the territorial unity with which it was committed to us by our fathers—I say, if such men entertain that conviction, I have little belief in their wisdom, and if they have wisdom, I have doubt in their nationality. [Cheers.] A man has but to take up the morning paper of to-day and read the difference of exchange, the premium upon gold. What does that indicate? That premium indicates the judgment entertained in the moneyed circles of the world upon the possibility of preserving the American Republic. [Cheers.] And the doubt, uncertainty and hesitation, with a less instructed people who live in other lands, is increased in magnitude by every Northern voice of dissent. If we have any hope at all for the preservation of this country, that hope lies in the continuous, the unabating and the vigorous prosecution of this war. I am not now giving voice to the excitement which a public speaker may be supposed to feel in the presence of a large body of his fellow-citizens; I am giving outward, distinct and direct utterance to the conviction that has been in my mind since the first shot was fired upon Sumter, since the first time that the American flag was insulted; and everything in the course of events has tended to convince me that there is no hope for the preservation of this nationality except in the vigorous prosecution of this war. [Cheers.] We may dissent upon the means by which it may be most effectually prosecuted, and I no doubt differ with a large number who are here. This is no place to discuss that difference, and I do not intend to discuss it. I am here to speak what I consider my duty, and I speak for no other man; I do not speak of the egregious egotism of a gentleman, who said that he spoke for one-fourth of the United States—the whole people of the West—that they were opposed to the prosecution of this war. There may be great evils in this war. War is always an evil, but allow me to say that there have been greater evils afflicting a nation than civil war. Civil war, while it destroys weak nations, strengthens strong ones. [Cheers.] The vigorous English nation grew out of 200 years of civil war; civil war had made France, and served to restore the past splendor

of Spain. If it had destroyed weak republics like those of South America, it was because they came within the general terms of the proposition he had explained. We could not now conjecture or fathom what would be the duration of this war, but so far as men might speak of the future, advised by the experience of the past, it would be short and the event certain. In regard to foreign intervention, the greatest we could raise against it would be united sentiment at the North, showing the world that, whatever might have been our differences of opinion in the past, there was no difference of opinion as to our duty of prosecuting this war to its ultimate result.

Judge Daly, after alluding to some of the useful lessons to be learned from this war in disenthralling the people from the tyranny of party organizations, concluded with an historical allusion, which should be impressed on the mind and form the answers of every true American.

When Admiral Blake was fighting the battles of England on the ocean, under the government of a man whom he disliked, he said to his men: "It is our duty to stand by and fight for the maintenance and preservation of the country, no matter in whose hands temporarily the government may be." [Loud cheers.]

Loud calls were then made for "Van Buren," and upon being introduced, Hon. John Van Buren spoke as follows:

SPEECH OF JOHN VAN BUREN.

Mr. Chairman and Fellow Citizens: I beg to return you my since thanks for the kindness with which you have received me to-night. I received, some days since, an invitation from several of your respectable gentlemen, with some of whom I have been for some time acquainted, to attend this meeting to-night, and to address those who should be here assembled. I was notified that Gen. Winfield Scott would preside, and I regret to learn that the state of his health—as was somewhat anticipated by the Committee who invited me—that the state of his health has proved to be such that he has been unable to attend. His place, however, is well supplied by the Mayor of your city, who is the presiding officer on this occasion. [Applause.] I was also informed of the resolutions that it was purposed to pass, and a copy of them was inclosed in the invitation I received to address you. I was requested to look at these resolutions, and unless I expressed some dissent I was notified I would be considered as assenting to them and to the use of my name. In looking over these resolutions, it seemed to me that, with some verbal and unimportant corrections, they are perfectly proper to be adopted, and I so stated to the gentlemen who invited me. I saw nothing in the resolutions, in the character of the gentlemen who invited me to attend, in the character or public career of the presiding officer who was expected to be present, that prevented my cordial participation in the proceedings of the meeting, and I therefore unconditionally accepted. [Applause.] * * * * * * I have no hesitation in saying that I cordially agree to the resolutions that have been adopted. [Applause.] I am for the vigorous prosecution of the war. [Applause.] I am for the prosecution of this war until this rebellion is wholly overthrown. [Applause.] I am for destroying the usurped government that has been set up over the Southern States, and this thing that calls itself a Confederate Government, and until that is done, I hold that all propositions for peace are entirely preposterous and absurd. [Applause.] Now, being for the war, I am necessarily with everybody that is for the war; and, being opposed to peace, I am necessarily opposed to every body that is for peace. [Applause.]

Without stopping to discuss disputed propositions—that would be of no avail—there is no doubt that there has been, for a great length of time, a large number of politicians in the South who have been determined to extend slavery to the free territory of the United States. They endeavored to use the organization of the Democratic party for that purpose, and, in 1848, they assumed such a position in regard to it, as to force what I considered the regular Democracy of the State of New York out of the Democratic party. [Applause.] The elections of '48 and '52 and '56 came to pass. The election of 1860 was the next that transpired; and, in the meantime, this disposition was manifested by various efforts to force slavery into Kansas, and other measures that it is

not necessary now to discusss, and to which I was always opposed. In 1860, in the Democratic Convention, they declared that the platform of the Convention should contain a recognition of the legality of slavery in all the territories of the United States, and they declared in addition that slavery should be protected by the General Government in all the territories belonging to the Union. The Democracy of the North refused to agree to that, and the Convention broke up. It reassembled at Baltimore, and again broke up, and the election of 1860 came on, the Southern men having a candidate of their own, and the Northern and Western Democracy supporting Mr. Douglas, and a large number of gentlemen supporting Mr. Lincon, resulting in the election of Mr. Lincoln. [Applause.] In that contest I took no part. I voted, but I did nothing more. No man ever heard me, in public or in private, express any opinion in regard to it, except when the election came off. I deposited my vote in opposition to Mr. Lincoln. [Voices—"Good."]

After that election, Congress assembled. Mr. Lincoln's message declared in the fullest manner, his unwillingness to interfere with slavery in the States. It recognized, in the fullest extent, the right of the different States to have slavery if they chose, and his entire indisposition to interfere with it; notwithstanding that, several States seceded from the Union, as they said. They held a convention, and resolved themselves out. Their representatives abandoned their seats in Congress; although they had control of the Senate, and House of Representatives, and the Supreme Court of the United States, they retired from the Congress of the United States. They went further, and set up a Government of their own, or said they did. Now, you all remember the debates between Webster and Hayne upon that subject, of the right to secede from the Union. Mr. Webster told Hayne what has since proven true—that that was mere rebellion, and when they put it in operation, they would see that in order to carry out what they assumed to be the right of peaceful secession and nullification, they must use force, and be met by force, and the law of bayonets must decide the controversy. [Applause.] This occurred.

They assumed to set up a government under the right which they claimed to destroy the Union. They formed a Congress, and elected a President. But they were not content with this. They seized the property of the United States—they seized its forts, its ships, its treasure. They fired upon the flag of the United States, at Fort Sumter, and claimed the right to exercise the power of a sovereign government. Now, you will bear in mind—every fair minded man in the United States will bear in mind—that up to this moment not one hair of their heads had been injured. *No right of any Southern man had been invaded. History will record that the world never witnessed a rebellion against a governmental authority before, where the rebels could not lay their finger upon a thing to show that either their property, their liberty, or their rights had been, in the slightest particular invaded.* [Great applause.] This being the fact, the city of New York sent forth 80,000 men to quell this rebellion. Her capitalists advanced $300,000,000 to put down this rebellion. The State of New York sent 200,000 men, and I am to argue, in the face of these facts, and the past history of this contest, that the rebellion is atrociously unjust, and that the war in which we have engaged with the South, is rightfully prosecuted by us in vindication of the Constitution and the Union. [Applause.]

Now, what is the condition of this contest? They were not satisfied with what I have detailed, but they announced they were going to establish a republic, the corner stone of which should be slavery, and they are now engaged in that task, in endeavoring to establish a republic on this continent, in 1863, *the corner stone of which shall be slavery.* Now, I went to Herkimer, in 1848, to lay a corner stone. But it was not this. [Laughter.] It was as much unlike this as anything you can possibly imagine, and it adds no additional attractions to the contest, as far as I am concerned, that they should avow this object in prosecuting the war.

It is now a contest forced upon the non-slaveholding and loyal slaveholding States, by those who are endeavoring to build up a republic based on slavery. *To prostrate a rebellion that has that object in view, I am willing to devote any means,*

any time, any exertions within my power, during the rest of my life. [Applause and three cheers.]

Now, let us see whether there is anything worth considering in what is suggested by those who dissent from us, and are unwilling to prosecute this war. The bill which has excited the sensibility of several gentlemen who have spoken in New Jersey, and at a certain hall in this city [hisses], was a bill which gives extraordinary powers over the purse and the sword to the President of the United States. They are bills which seek to protect by indemnity, the President, and those connected with him, from arrest They are opposed to another bill, as I understand, which has become the law, which authorizes the President, in his discretion, to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus.* [Applause.] I will state now, as briefly as I can, what are my views in regard to this. In the first place, as to the bill which gives the President the enormous power over the sword and the purse, I agree that it makes him almost a dictator. I agree that it is a very great stretch of power.

[A Voice—He ought to have it.]

I argue that unless there be a necessity for it, it should not be done. Every body knows that in prosecuting a war under a republican government, which consists of several States, the great apprehension is, that there may not be unity on the part of the States, sufficient to impart energy to the executive heads. That was predicated as one of the grounds upon which our system of government would fail. I call the attention of my democratic friends to this, because there seems to be particular solicitude about them now. [Laughter.] The President was given the power of the purse and the sword in 1839, when Great Britain had directed forcible possession to be taken of a portion of the State of Maine, and Sir John Harvey had moved troops of Great Britain into that territory to hold it. The Governor of the State of Maine met this action by moving Maine troops on to the same territory. The President of the United States called the attention of Congress to it, and left it to their own wisdom what ought to be done. Now I hold in my hand a copy of the bill that they passed upon that occasion, in 1839.

I will state to you the substance of the various sections, without detaining you at this late hour, by reading the bill. The first section puts the whole naval and military force of the United States, and the militia, at the disposal of the President. [Applause.] The second declares that the militia, when called out, shall be compelled to serve six months. The third gives the President power to call out 50,000 volunteers. In those days, when our army had never reached 8,000 men, it was a weighty matter to call out 50,000 men, and was regarded as an enormous authority. [Laughter.] The fourth section gives the President power to complete and employ all the armed vessels of the United States—thus putting the whole army and navy of the United States at his disposal. [Applause.] The fifth section appropriates $10,000,000 to carry into effect the provisions of this act. In those days ten millions of dollars was a great deal of money. [Laughter.] The sixth section appropriates $18,000 to send a special minister to Great Britain. The seventh section authorizes him to expend a million of dollars in finishing the fortifications upon our seaboard, and building them. The eighth section directs that the militia and volunteers, when called out, shall be portions of the army of the United States. Now how do you suppose that bill passed? It put the whole purse and sword into the absolute power of the President of the United States. Clay, Webster, and Calhoun—men, perhaps, inferior to the Solons of our day [laughter]—were members of the Senate. The bill passed the Senate, and these three statesmen—although all violently opposed, personally and politically, to the then President of the United States—voted for the bill, and it passed the Senate unanimously. [Applause.] It passed the House of Representatives, after a full discussion, by a vote of 201 to 6, and the leader of that six was Henry A. Wise [hisses], the bold brigadier who distinguished himself so greatly at Nag's Head [laughter], while his brigade was fighting and his son dying. [Applause.]

Now, let us see whether the Democracy of our day was alarmed at this union of the purse and the sword, and in the first place, let us see how the political opponents of the Administration

treated it. Gov. Seward was then Governor of the State of New York, having been elected in 1838, and a political opponent of the President. On the 7th of March he communicated this act to the Legislature, with a most praiseworthy message, concluding thus: "I respectfully call your attention to this subject, with the expectation that an expression on our part of concurrence in the policy of the General Government will contribute to avert the calamities of war and cause a speedy and honorable adjustment of the difficulties between this country and Great Britain." Mr. Isaac L. Varian was then Chairman of the Democratic General Committee, and Mr. Elijah F. Purdy was one of the Secretaries. They called a meeting of the Democrats of this city, and over that meeting Mr. Holmes presided, and for Vice-Presidents were men whose names, when read to any Democrat, will bring back associations of great interest, and perhaps of some sadness, unless he supposes that the prominent Democrats in the city now, are more respectable than those whose names I will read. The Vice-Presidents were Henry Yates, Walter Bowne, Samuel Tappan, Myndert Van Schaick, Gideon Tucker, Abraham Van Nest; and they resolved, not that there was danger in the union of the purse and the sword—not that it was a usurpation—but that it was a prompt and patriotic measure on the part of the House of Representatives. [Loud cheers.] Let us see how it was received by the electors. It was on the 2d and 3d days of March, as I have stated to you. The election in New Hampshire came on then, as it will now, within a few days after the adjournment of Congress; and New Hampshire, which had been somewhat equally divided, gave 7,000 majority for the Democratic ticket. I shall be pleased if my Democratic friends find it gives a large majority now. [Cheers and laughter.] The city of New York, by a defection of the conservative portion of the Democracy, had been thrown into the hands of what was then call the Whigs. The city election almost immediately followed, and the city was recovered. Isaac L. Varian was elected mayor by a thousand majority, and twelve out of seventeen Wards gave Democratic majorities, immediately after this extraordinary usurpation. Gen. Scott, who was to have presided here this evening, fortunately for the country, was then prominent in the command of the armies of the United States. On the 7th of March he went to Maine, and he remained there until about the 21st, when he concluded an arrangement with Lieutenant Gov. Harvey, by which the British troops retirep from their position in the State of Maine, the Maine troops also retired, and civil officers were left in protection of the public property, and by his wisdom and his foresight, by the 24th of March he was able to report to the Government of the United States that the whole difficulty had passed over. [Applause.] Congress assembled in December, and the President of the United States made this communica tion to them:

"The extraordinary powers vested in me by an Act of Congress, for the defence of the country in an emergency, considered so far probable as to require that the Executive should possess ample means to meet it, have not been exerted. They have, therefore, been attended with no other result than to increase, by the confidence thus reposed in me, my obligations to maintain, with religious exactness, the cardinal principles that govern our intercourse with other nations. Happily, in our pending questions with Great Britain, out of which this unusual grant of authority arose, nothing has occurred to require its exertion; and, as it is about to return to the Legislature, I trust that no future necessity may call for its exercise by them or its delegation to another Department of the Government."

Not a dollar was expended, not a volunteer was called out, not a man from the militia was brought into the field under this act; and I would be glad to know why it may not happen that this extraordinary demonstration on the part of the Congress of the United States, of the power and resources of the loyal portion of this Confederacy, will not again be followed up by a similar auspicious result. The successful way to prosecute a war is to make an overwhelming demonstration of strength to satisfy those who are prepared to resist the rightful authority of the Government, that the resistance is useless, and that this must be crushed out. [Cheers.] *Now, gentlemen, there is nothing, in my humble judgment, therefore, in*

the law passed putting this enormous power in the possession of the President of the United States, to deter me from assenting to a vigorous prosecution of the war. [*Cheers.*] *I can very well understand how, if I sympathize with the rebellion—if I deemed that this war should fail—I could spend hours and columns in picking flaws in this act. But if I believed that substantial justice required that the great ends of prosecuting the war demand that the whole power of the Government shall be lodged by the Congress of the United States in the President of the United States, I will bow in silence to the act, whether I approve of it or not.* [*Prolonged Cheers.*]

If the President of the United States had usurped these powers, there might be a degree of propriety in denouncing it; but when the representatives of the people, legally elected, after due deliberation, assume the responsibility of lodging these trusts in him, in my humble judgment, and certainly in view of the precedent to which I have referred, no wise man will ever complain of the act. [Applause.] * * * *

Gentlemen, I believe that it is just as much our duty to unite in a vigorous prosecution of the war under the President of the United States, as it was when the war was first declared, notwithstanding anything that may have been done. Now, there is a great anxiety felt as to the course of the Democrats. Gentlemen, a Democrat is a peculiar institution. It does no good to drive the Democrats—to bully or to attempt to intimidate them,—they will have their own way, was always as I have found. But I never shall be made to believe that the men who stood by George Clinton and their fathers before them, in the Revolution, who stood by Tompkins and Jackson in 1812, who stood by Polk and Marcy in the Mexican war, will be found wanting in this. It remains to be seen whether they will or not. But my own course will be wholly uninfluenced by that of any one else. I have been cautioned by a great many people about attending this meeting to-night. I was told that it was an insidious attempt to disintegrate the Democratic Party, and a newspaper which joined us last fall, [laughter,] and many representatives in Congress who never joined us at all, have great fear that I will do something to disintegrate the Democratic Party. Now, if the whole party should differ with those to whom I have adverted, we should be no more distintegrated than we were before. My representative I have a very high opinion of. He seems to be very willing to represent the whole of our State, and a very considerable part of New Jersey, [laughter,] and looking at his paper this evening, I perceive that he has taken charge of the Governments of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, and several other States. It is not often that a man is favored with being provided with such extensive plans of usefulness. I read a speech that he made before the Democratic Union Association on the 3d of March, as it was reported in the *World*, on the 4th. Without undertaking to say what was proper for him to say or for him to omit, I will say that I thank God that he was not my representative until noon the next day. The Democratic party, as you all know, nine years out of ten, controls the Government of the country. It requires, therefore, no more patriotism on their part to be attached to the Government and the country. It is, in fact, an attachment to themselves. [Laughter.] As a general rule, they are wise, prudent, and patriotic. Occasionally, blind guides or bad drivers take some sleepy passengers into bad roads, and upset them as they did in 1848. [Laughter.] But then they wake up; the passengers get out [laughter]; they inquire the right road; they get a lantern, and eventually they come all right. [Laughter.] I think they will do so now, and yet it seemed to me as a careful man, looking at their course, just at this moment, that it was prudent for me to get out and walk. [Great laughter—" three cheers."] Whether I shall step through to get in again or not, or foot it through, depends upon circumstances. [Renewed laughter.]

But, fellow citizens, whatever I am doing, and whatever anybody else does, I shall sustain this war to the bitter end. [*Cheers.*] *And the city of New York will do it; after sending eighty thousand men, and spending three hundred millions of dollars, they will not hesitate to go through; and the State, in my humble judgment, will not hesitate to go through.*

Why, was there anything ever more preposter-

ous than the idea, that when we are told by the Southern men, that we must recognize their independence before they will treat with us, that we should be wasting time in undertaking to negotiate for peace? *When the President of the Confederate Republic, as he claims to be, denounced the best men of the North, and East, and West, as pirates and hyenas, and, what he seems to suppose worse than all, as Yankees,* [*laughter,*] *is it possible to make terms with him, or to listen with composure to any arrangement for an accommodation?* ["No."] *Why, who are the men that have been sent from the State of New York, who are thus denounced by this rebel chieftain? I have differed from a great many of them, politically; I have differed from a great many of them personally; but when you find the Kearneys, the Van Rensselaers, the Hamiltons, the Schuylers, the Dixs, the Campbells, the Cambrelings, the Dewers, the Kings, the Wadsworths, the Howlands and the Vosburghs, the best blood of the State of New York, who are thus denounced as pirates, why, I submit that it requires more than ordinary composure to listen to it. Yankees! They are the Knickbockers of New York; they are the best men of the State of New York; and when they peril their lives, and shed their blood in defence of the constitution of the country, and the Union of the States, he who denounced them as pirates and hyenas, is as forgetful of the principles of truth and honor that should govern the language of a gentleman, as he is traitorous to the flag under which he acquired political fame.* [*Loud applause.*] WE HAVE NOTHING TO DO BUT FIGHT THIS MATTER THROUGH.

We can have no discussion in regard to it, and it behooves us to look around and see what assistance we are to receive, or what interference we are to meet with. Let me say one moment to you, that I am not one of those who unite in this sentiment of anxiety about the course of Great Britain. I happen to have had peculiar opportunities which it is not necessary now to advert to, for knowing the people of Great Britain for the last thirty years. They will be neutral, and, in my humble judgment, that is all we have the right to expect. Nations are like individuals. When two gentlemen resort to the arbitrament of arms, no other person feels himself at liberty to interfere in the quarrel, and when two nations, cultivated and civilized, or claiming to be such, resort to arms, all we have a right to ask, in my humble judgment, of any third person, is, that they shall not interfere, but shall stand neutral. Now, all the public acts of the Government of Great Britain, all the declarations of her prominent men, all the correspondence of her minister, all the general sources of information, compel us to believe that they mean to observe strictly neutrality. Gentlemen tell me that they allow vessels to be fitted out at their private ship-yards. Well, it is for us to remember that we are to be at peace before long, and Europe is to be at war, and whatever our ship-yards or the owners of them, and our merchants, say they will allow the Government of the United States to forbid them from doing, when European nations are at war, exactly that we have a right to insist that the British Government shall prohibit the ship-builders of Great Britain from doing—no more and no less. We must live up to our own law. Now, it is not a violation of any neutral act, in my judgment, in Great Britain or here, to build a ship and sell it to a government that is at war with us. It is seized as contraband, if you can get it—fair prize of war; but it is no violation of the neutrality of Great Britain, and no violation of our neutrality. If our ship-owners and ship-builders desire such an amendment to be made to the neutrality act of Great Britain, then it is a fair matter of discussion whether it shall be one. But short of that, believe me, he cannot compel them to do any more than we are willing to do ourselves. But the Government and people of Great Britain have unquestionably a sympathy with the people of the Southern States in the contest, and while they do not feel at liberty to interfere, and ought not to be asked to interfere, in my humble judgment, we have their good wishes, and never had apprehended any acts on their part of an unfriendly character. Russia, beyond all doubt, is entirely friendly. The Emperor of the French will do exactly as he thinks is entirely for his own interest. I am not one of those who attach any importance to what he declares he will do, because his declarations to the French people were never kept, and I haven't any idea that his

declaration to us will be observed, unless it is for his benefit. He and his prominent men about him have nothing in their past lives to offer as hostages for their conduct. They live in the present. He holds his Government by force—whatever is necessary to maintain himself, that is exactly what he will do. And in my judgment, when he sees that he must go alone, that he will have no co-operation from other Powers, he will refuse to interfere in this quarrel, and will let us alone. But, gentlemen, we must depend upon ourselves; if we can fight this battle to victory, we shall—if we cannot, we shall be defeated. But beyond all earthly considerations, we must unite—that is our highest consideration—and being united, I have no doubt about the result. I do not look forward to a long war—a great many people do. It is not the habit of modern times to have long wars. The great improvement in the engines of destruction, enables nations to bring war rapidly to a close. The Russian campaign was not long; the Italian campaign was a short one, and in my judgment this war will be a short one, if we are united, and put forward the whole power of the loyal States of this Union. With our immense population and resources, we ought to end this war in ninety days. Start your troops in New Orleans, at Vicksburg, at Charleston, and in Tennessee. Charge along the whole line—advance with energy and will—Union—and my word for it, in ninety days everybody will wonder that this rebellion was ever regarded as formidable in any portion of the United States. [Prolonged cheers.]

REAL DEMOCRATIC SENTIMENT.

The patriotic speech of Mr. John Van Buren, at the Cooper Institute, last Friday evening, is bringing him congratulations and good words from Union-loving men of all parties, in all parts of the country. We print below three letters received by him—one from Gen. Dix, one from Mr. Gerrit Smith, and one from a Maryland slaveholder, all alike approving his course.

FROM GERRIT SMITH, ESQ.

Peterboro, March 10, 1863.

Mr. JOHN VAN BUREN—My Dear Sir: I read with great pleasure the report of your speech, made a few weeks ago; with greater pleasure have I read the report of your speech made last Friday evening.

I rejoice to see you rise above party and consecrate your large influence to the salvation of your country.

I believe with you that the rebellion can and should be put down very speedily. We should all feel that, until it is put down, democrats, republicans and abolitionists have nothing else to do than to put it down.

In haste, your friend,

GERRIT SMITH.

FROM GEN. DIX.

Fortress Monroe, March 10, 1863.

My Dear Sir: * * * * * * * I have not time often to read the newspapers, but I have read with great pleasure your able and patriotic speech, at the Cooper Institute. I wish, most heartily, that you could carry all the democrats in New York with you.

We have only to persevere and we shall succeed, in spite of all mistakes. I had a man from Richmond with me yesterday. He gives a gloomy account of things there. Here are some of the prices:

Beef, one dollar per pound; pork, one dollar and a quarter; butter, three dollars per pound; bacon, one dollar and fifteen cents per pound; tea, none to be had except at fabulous prices; coffee, do; eggs, two dollars per dozen; calico, two dollars per yard; ready-made coat, from eighty to one hundred dollars; soft wool hat, from twenty-five to thirty dollars. My informant had on an ordinary pair of boots, for which he paid sixty dollars.

These prices are in Confederate money. One dollar in gold brings three dollars and fifty cents in Confederate bills. One dollar in our Treasury notes brings two dollars in Confederate bills.

I have the same accounts from other sources. I am respectfully yours,

JOHN A. DIX.

Hon. John Van Buren.

FROM A MARYLAND SLAVEHOLDER.

Cumberland, Maryland, March 10.

Dear Sir: Having read in the Baltimore *American* the remarks you made at the Cooper Institute, I cannot refrain from expressing the pleasure they afforded me and the loyal citizens in our section of the State. Residing, as we do, immediately upon the lines, being within a stone's throw of Virginia, and being familiar with the uncompromising and defiant spirit prevailing there, I have thought for a long time that the North was laboring under a fatal mistake in supposing that any conciliatory policy on their part would reconcile the enemy. I can, moreover, state, from my own observation, that the divisions in sentiment in the North, have contributed greatly to embolden them. You may rest assured, that if the North purposes to put down the rebellion, the only way it can be done is by presenting a united front and by force of arms.

I am a native of this State, and have a very numerous family connection, and, with hardly an exception, all own slaves. I need hardly add, that I was opposed to interference with the slavery question. But when the Republican party passed the constitutional amendment forever protecting the institution in States where it exists, it was all the South could reasonably ask, and that having been rejected, my feelings have undergone a great change, and I am now for vindicating the authority of the government, even if slavery goes to the wall. And such, I believe, is the prevailing sentiment of the loyal men of our State.

As I have not the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with you, I hope you will excuse the liberty I have taken in addressing you.

Very respectfully yours, ——

John Van Buren, Esq., New York.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 4.

THE THREE VOICES:

THE

SOLDIER, FARMER, AND POET,

TO THE COPPERHEADS.

THE PATRIOT FARMER'S DEFIANCE TO TRAITORS.

On the last day of the Illinois Legislature, in February, 1863, Mr. Funk, a Senator from McLean county, delivered a speech, which is thus described and reported by the Springfield correspondent of the Chicago *Tribune:*

A great sensation was created by a speech by Mr. Funk, one of the richest farmers in the State, a man who pays over three thousand dollars per annum taxes towards the support of the Government. The lobby and gallery were crowded with spectators. Mr. Funk rose to object to trifling resolutions, which had been introduced by the Democrats to kill time and stave off a vote upon the appropriations for the support of the State Government. He said:

Mr. Speaker, I can sit in my seat no longer and see such by-play going on. These men are trifling with the best interests of the country. They should have asses' ears to set off their heads, or they are traitors and secessionists at heart.

I say that there are traitors and secessionists at heart in this

Senate. Their actions prove it. Their speeches prove it. Their gibes and laughter and cheers here nightly, when their speakers get up to denounce the war and the Administration, prove it.

I can sit here no longer and not tell these traitors what I think of them. And while so telling them, I am responsible, myself, for what I say. I stand upon my own bottom. I am ready to meet any man on this floor in any manner, from a pin's point to the mouth of a cannon, upon this charge against these traitors. [Tremendous applause from the galleries.]

I am an old man of sixty-five ; I came to Illinois a poor boy ; I have made a little something for myself and family. I pay three thousand dollars a year in taxes. I am willing to pay six thousand, aye, twelve thousand, [great cheering, the old gentleman striking the desk with a blow that would knock down a bullock, and causing the inkstand to fly in the air,] aye, I am willing to pay my whole fortune, and then give my life, to save my country from these traitors that are seeking to destroy it. [Tremendous applause, which the Speaker could not control.]

Mr. Speaker, you must please excuse me; I could not sit longer in my seat and calmly listen to these traitors. My heart, that feels for my poor country, would not let me. My heart, that cries out for the lives of our brave volunteers in the field, that these traitors at home are destroying by thousands, would not let me. My heart, that bleeds for the widows and orphans at home, would not let me. Yes, these traitors and villains in this Senate [striking his clenched fist on the desk with a blow that made the Senate ring again] are killing my neighbors' boys now fighting in the field. I dare to say this to these traitors right here, and I am responsible for what I say to any one or all of them. [Cheers.] Let them come on now, right here. I am sixty-five years old, and I have made up my mind to risk my life right here, on this floor, for my country. [Mr. Funk's seat is near the lobby railing, and a crowd collected around him, evidently with the intention of protecting him from violence, if necessary. The last announcement was received with great cheering, and I saw many an eye flash and many a countenance grow radiant with the light of defiance.]

These men sneered at Colonel Mack a few days since.* He is a small man, but I am a large man. I am ready to meet any of them in place of Colonel Mack. I am large enough for them, and I hold myself ready for them now and at any time. [Cheers from the galleries.]

Mr. Speaker, these traitors on this floor should be provided with hempen collars. They deserve them. They deserve hanging, I say, [raising his voice, and violently striking the desk;] the country would be the better of swinging them up. I go for hanging them, and I dare to tell them so, right here to their traitorous faces. Traitors should be hung. It would be the salvation of the country to hang them. For that reason I must rejoice at it. [Tremendous cheering.]

Mr. Speaker, I beg pardon of the gentlemen in this Senate who are not traitors, but true loyal men, for what I have said. I only intend it and mean it for secessionists at heart. They are here in this Senate. I see them gibe, and smirk, and grin at the true Union men. Must I defy them? I stand here ready for them, and dare them to come on. [Great cheering.] What man, with the heart of a patriot, could stand this treason any longer? I have stood it long enough. I will stand it no more. [Cheers.] I denounce these men and their aiders and abettors as rank traitors and secessionists. Hell itself could not spew out a more traitorous crew than some of the men that disgrace this Legislature, this State, and this country. For myself, I protest against and denounce their treasonable acts. I have voted against their measures; I will do so to the end. I will denounce them as long as God gives me breath; and I am ready to meet the traitors themselves, here or any where, and fight them to the death. [Prolonged cheers and shouts.]

I said I paid three thousand dollars a year taxes. I do not say it to brag of it. It is my duty, yes, Mr. Speaker, my privilege, to do it. But some of these traitors here, who are working night and day to put their miserable little bills and

---

* Hon. A. W. Mack delivered a powerful speech in the Senate of Illinois, on the thirteenth of February, in opposition to the Armistice Resolutions of the "Copperheads."

claims through the Legislature, to take money out of the pockets of the people, are talking about high taxes. They are hypocrites as well as traitors. I heard some of them talking about high taxes in this way, who do not pay five dollars, to the support of the Government. I denouuce them as hypocrites as well as traitors. [Cheers.]

The reason they pretend to be afraid of high taxes is, that they do not want to vote money for the relief of the soldiers. They want to embarrass the Government and stop the war. They want to aid the secessionists to conquer our boys in the field. They care about high taxes! They are picayune men, any how, and pay no taxes at all, and never did, and never hope or expect to. This is an excuse of traitors. [Cheers.]

Mr. Speaker, excuse me. I feel for my country, in this her hour of danger, from the tips of my toes to the ends of my hair. That is the reason I speak as I do. I can not help it. I am bound to tell these men to their teeth what they are, and what the people, the true loyal people, think of them. [Tremendous cheering. The Speaker rapped upon his desk, apparently to stop it, but really to add to its volume, for I could see by his flushed cheek and flashing eye that his heart was with the brave and loyal old gentleman.]

Mr. Speaker, I have said my say. I am no speaker. This is the only speech I have made, and I do not know that it deserves to be called a speech. I could not sit still any longer and see these scoundrels and traitors work out their hellish schemes to destroy the Union. They have my sentiments; let them, one and all, make the most of them. I am ready to back up all I say, and I repeat it, to meet these traitors in any manner they may choose, from a pin's point to the mouth of a cannon. [Tremendous applause, during which the old gentleman sat down, after he had given the desk a parting whack, which sounded loud above the din of cheers and clapping of hands.]

I never before witnessed so much excitement in an assembly. Mr. Funk spoke with a force of natural eloquence, with a conviction and truthfulness, with a fervor and pathos which wrought up the galleries, and even members on the floor, to the highest pitch of excitement. His voice was heard in the

stores that surround the square, and the people came flocking in from all quarters. In five minutes he had an audience that packed the hall to its utmost capacity. After he had concluded, the Republican members and spectators rushed up and took him by the hand to congratulate him. The Democrats said nothing, but evidently felt the castigation they were receiving most keenly, as might be seen from their blanched cheeks and restless and uneasy glances.

THE

PATRIOT SOLDIER AND HERO.

GENERAL ROSECRANS TO THE LEGISLATURES OF OHIO AND INDIANA.

On Tuesday last, in the Ohio Legislature, a message was received from the Governor, enclosing the following letter from General Rosecrans :

HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMANT OF THE CUMBERLAND,
MURFREESBORO, TENN., Feb. 3d, 1863.

To the Honorable the General Assembly of the State of Ohio :

The resolution of thanks passed by your honorable body to the army of the Cumberland, its Commanding General and his staff, has been duly received and published to the troops of his command. On behalf of all, I return you heartfelt thanks.

This is, indeed, a war for the maintenance of the Constitution and the laws—nay, for national existence—against those who have despised our honest friendship, deceived our just hopes, and driven us to defend our country and our homes. By foul and wilful slanders on our motives and intentions, persistently repeated, they have arrayed against us our own fellow-citizens, bound to us by the triple ties of consanguinity, geographical position, and commercial interest.

Let no man among us be base enough to forget this, or fool enough to trust an oligarchy of traitors to their friends, to civil liberty and human freedom. Voluntary exiles from home and friends, for the defence and safety of all, we long for the time when gentle peace shall again spread her wings over our land ; but we know no such blessing is possible while the unjust and

arbitrary power of the rebel leaders confronts and threatens us. Crafty as the fox, cruel as the tiger, they cried "no coercion" while preparing to strike us. Bully like, they proposed to fight us, because they said they could whip five to one, and now, when driven back, they whine out "no invasion," and promise us of the West permission to navigate the Mississippi, if we will be "good boys" and do as they bid us.

Whenever they have the power, they drive before them into their ranks the Southern people, and they would also drive us. Trust them not. Were they able, they would invade and destroy us without mercy. Absolutely assured of these things, I am amazed that any one could think of "peace on any terms." He who entertains the sentiment is fit only to be a slave; he who utters it at this time is, moreover, a traitor to his country, who deserves the scorn and contempt of all honorable men. When the power of the unscrupulous rebel leaders is removed, and the people are free to consider and act for their own interests, which are common with ours, under this Government, there will be no great difficulty in fraternization. Between our tastes and social life there are fewer differences than between those of the people of the northern and southern provinces of England or Ireland.

Hoping the time may speedily come when, the power of the perfidious and cruel tyrant of this rebellion having been overthrown, a peace may be laid on the broad foundation of national unity and equal justice to all, under the Constitution and Laws, I remain your fellow-citizen,

W. S. Rosecrans,
Major-General.

In response to resolutions of thanks from the Indiana Legislature, General Rosecrans has written the following letter:

HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE CUMBERLAND,
MURFREESBORO, TENN., February 18, 1863.

Gentlemen,—In the name of the officers and soldiers of the army of the Cumberland, I thank you for the resolutions of congratulation, approval and condolence you have sent us on account of the battle of Stone's River.

At the call of constitutional liberty, the brave and true men of the West laid aside peaceful pursuits, left their homes and sought to qualify themselves to fight for a government that had cost the blood and treasures of two great wars and eighty years of time to establish.

For twenty weary months this army has stood guard to keep the confederate wolf from your doors. They know what hunger, cold, weary marches, and painful watchings it has cost to preserve our homes from invasion, and our friends and neighbors from conscription; it is, therefore, doubly a pleasure to hear these free and cheering words now from home.

The unscrupulous despots in our front call us "Lincoln hirelings," and we hear that this calumny has lately been repeated at home by some of the men whose property and persons have been kept safe, by our toil and blood, from the ruthless hands of Kirby Smith, Bragg and Morgan. Presuming on our absence, these men talk as if we were not citizens, and speak mockingly of our patriotism. They stab in the back the most generous, true-hearted men in the country, while standing guard in front of their doors, and they prolong the war by encouraging the rebels to hope for divided counsels at our homes.

I speak the conviction of the officers and men of this army, when I say we fight to secure equal rights to all, under the Constitution and the laws—we fight in defence of our homes and hearths, sure to be invaded, if the rebel despots who began the war can get the power. But we long for peace —we pray for peace, and we fight for peace—not for a dishonorable peace—not for a hollow truce. We have once been deceived by the cry of "No coercion," and of "State rights," and have seen how the rebel leaders practise in East

Tennessee, Missouri, Western Virginia, and Kentucky. We have met the masses of the South, and are witnesses of the falsehood, calumny, and perfidy by which they have been led to wage war against us. We have seen flags of truce violated, hospitals, ambulances, and boats, bearing flags, fired upon, and our sick and wounded stripped of their blankets and robbed of their food and medicines—we have been approached in battle by rebels wearing our uniforms and carrying our colors.

After witnessing the wholesale slander of us, their perfidy and treachery toward the masses of their own people, and the unfair and dishonorable means to which they resort to gain an advantage, we have been forced to the immovable but sad conviction that the LEADERS of this rebellion are *perfidious*, *treacherous*, *unscrupulous*, and cruel—their leaders never will nor can be peaceable, or true friends and neighbors. And that, as Mr. Davis has said, they only want the power, not the will, to invade and subjugate us.

We should rejoice to see the power of these leaders fall by the hand of their own people, whom they oppress; that people for whose rights we fight, in common with our own; but unless it does thus fall, we must destroy it, or it will destroy our nation, and our children will pass under the yoke of a military despotism raised on the sable foundation of negro slavery, and the more degrading servitude of the "poor whites," such as now overshadows the South. I say, "our children will pass under the yoke," for that could only happen after the brave and true men of the country—her citizen-soldiers—shall have perished, or, deserted by the wretches whose homes they have hitherto protected, heart-broken and despairing, shall quit the field and give to slavery and to its domination all those who love *money* more than *honor*, and *peace* more than *freedom*.

The issue is a plain one. If we who battle for national existence are not to be sustained by our own friends at home, the sooner we know it the better. We do not wish to be deceived as to our position, nor fall victims to the treachery, cowardice, or selfishness of those whom we have loved and trusted.

W. S. ROSECRANS,
Major General.

To the Honorable the Legislative Assembly of the State of Indiana.

Another letter from General Rosecrans:

HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF THE CUMBERLAND,
MURFREESBORO, February 17, 1863.

My Dear Sir,—Your letter on behalf of the Committee, inviting me to participate at Nashville in the celebration of the one hundred and thirty-first birth-day of Washington, the Father of his Country and the friend of constitutional liberty, has been received.

Most gladly would I join you if duties did not prevent.

I speak the heartfelt convictions of this army when I say that the necessity of preserving the Constitution, framed and established by Washington and his contemporaries, brought us from our homes; the conviction that we fight for the rights of all, against anarchy or remorseless tyranny, has put arms in our hands, hitherto exercised only in peaceful labors; retains us in the field, and will retain us there until constitutional liberty and national unity shall be secured, or we, with our once glorious country—the land of Washington—live only in the memory of the unhappy survivors of the wreck of the fairest fabric ever reared to freedom by the hand of man.

The success of the rebellion would be the triumph of arbitrary and unscrupulous despotism over liberty, reason and justice. Its downfall is demanded by the common interests and future hopes of the whole American people.

W. S. ROSECRANS,
Major-General.

To ABRAM MYERS, Esq., Chairman of Committee of Councils.

THE PATRIOT POET AND THE PATRIOT'S OATH.

At a recent Union celebration in Cincinnati, T. Buchanan Read, Esq., recited his beautiful poem entitled "The Oath:"

THE OATH.

Hamlet—Swear on my sword.
Ghost (below)—*Swear!*—Shakspeare.

Ye freemen, how long will ye stifle
The vengeance that justice inspires?
With treason how long will ye trifle
And shame the proud name of your sires?
Out, out with the sword and the rifle
In defence of your homes and your fires.
The flag of the old revolution
Swear firmly to serve and uphold,
That no treasonous breath of pollution
Shall tarnish one star on its fold.
Swear!
And hark, the deep voices replying
From graves where your fathers are lying,
"*Swear, oh! swear.*"

In this moment who hesitates, barters
The rights which his forefathers won,
He forfeits all claims to the charters
Transmitted from sire to son.
Kneel, kneel at the graves of our martyrs
And swear on your sword and your gun:
Lay up your great oath on an altar
As huge and as strong as Stonehenge,
And then with sword, fire, and halter,
Sweep down to the field of revenge,
Swear!
And hark, the deep voices replying
From graves where your fathers are lying,
"*Swear, oh! swear.*"

By the tombs of your sires and brothers,
The host which the traitors have slain,
By the tears of your sisters and mothers,
In secret concealing their pain,
The grief which the heroine smothers,
Consuming the heart and the brain—
By the sigh of the penniless widow,
By the sob of her orphan's despair,
Where they sit in their sorrowful shadow,
Kneel, kneel, every freeman and swear:
Swear!
And hark, the deep voices replying
From graves where your fathers are lying,
"*Swear, oh! swear.*"

On mounds which are wet with the weeping
Where a Nation has bowed to the sod,
Where the noblest of martyrs are sleeping
Let the winds bear your vengeance abroad;
And your firm oaths be held in the keeping
Of your patriot hearts and your God.
Over Ellsworth, for whom the first tear rose,
While to Baker and Lyon you look—
By Winthrop, a star among heroes,
By the blood of our murdered McCook,
Swear!
And hark, the deep voices replying
From the graves where your fathers are lying,
"*Swear, oh! swear.*"

Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No. 863 Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

No. 5.

VOICES FROM THE ARMY!

THE SOLDIERS OPEN THEIR BATTERIES ON THE COPPERHEADS.

THE PRESIDENT CORDIALLY SUSTAINED.

NO COMPROMISE WITH TRAITORS!

WHAT OUR SOLDIERS SAY ABOUT THE COPPERHEADS.

There is an old story of an Irishman who complained of the incivility of a famous echo, near the Lakes of Killarney. He shouted: "I've got ye now!" and received, somewhat to his surprise, the reply: "You lie!" The Copperheads of the Northern and Western States have come unexpectedly upon a similar experience. Their cries of treason are echoed back from the army, but the echo is a cry of loyalty, determined and often fierce, which will probably prevent them from tempting fortune in that direction again.

Some little time was needed for our gallant soldiers in the field to awaken to the consciousness that a set of men who had carefully remained at home, were conspiring, with double-dyed treachery, to sell them to the enemy. But now they are awake, and from every direction, from every army, responses come which show that our soldiers are loyal to the core, and not only loyal, but confident in their power to beat both the enemy in their front and the enemy in their rear. In whatever State the copperheads have been at work, from the soldiers of that State come up words of rebuke to sneaking traitors at home, words of devotion to the Union and to lawful liberty. And as in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio these copperheads have been most loud-voiced and active, so from the soldiers of these States we have the most abundant demonstrations of courage and fidelity to our Government.

General Rosecrans, bravest and best, no politician, but a quiet, unostentatious soldier, wrote to the Ohio legislature a letter which Washington might have written in the Revolution. He says:

"I am amazed that any one can think of peace on any terms. He who entertains this sentiment is fit only to be a slave; he who utters it at this time, is, moreover, a traitor to his country, who deserves the scorn and contempt of all honorable men."

The officers of Ohio regiments in Rosecrans' army had a meeting on the 12th, and adopted a strong address and resolutions against the treasonable peace movement of the copperhead politicians. The resolutions were universally and enthusiastically approved by the Ohio regiments. They say:

"If some miserable demagogues among you must vomit forth their treason, let them keep it at home. We want none of their vile letters, speeches, or papers here. The Army of the West is in terrible earnest. Earnest to conquer and destroy armed rebels. Earnest to meet force with force. Earnest in its hearty detestation of cowardly traitors at home. Earnest in will and power to overcome all who desire the nation's ruin. Ohio's one hundred thousand soldiers in the field, citizens at home, potent in their capacity, ask their fathers, brothers, and friends by their firesides and in their peaceful homes to hear and heed this appeal, and to put an end to covert treason at home, more dangerous now to our material existence than the presence of armed hosts of misguided rebels at home."

A correspondent on the ground writes:

"The cheers with which the address was received by the Ohio regiments would have sent a thrill of joy to the heart of every loyal man in the country."

The officers of the One Hundred and Sixteenth Ohio volunteers held a meeting at Romney, Virginia, on the 10th, in which they resolved:

"That we will hail with feelings of delight the dawnings of peace; but we think of no peace worth having short of crushing out the rebellion and the complete restoration of the authority of the government over every foot of her soil, East, West, North, and South.

"That nothing but an unconditional surrender on the part of the rebels will answer the demand of the true soldier and patriot.

"That we regard the efforts of the copperheads of Ohio to demoralize the army by writing treasonable letters to the soldiers in the field, by urging them to desert their flag, by misrepresenting the Administration and the objects of the war, and by all the means conceived only by traitors, as unworthy American citizens and more dangerous and heinous than the efforts of armed rebels who meet us in deadly conflict on the battle-field.

"That we will cause to be remembered those cowardly grumblers and traitors, craven spirits, who, instead of aiding us in our noble purpose by their presence in the ranks, are at home aiding and abetting rebels by keeping up a fire in our rear."

"Soldiers of the Fifteenth Corps" write to the Cincinnati *Commercial* from before Vicksburg:

"We didn't take an oath to fight against traitors in the South alone—no; and we will willingly shoot down traitors in the North, whenever they go too far in their wicked schemes. They have gone far enough now, and their infernal design against our dear Union must be crushed. They may talk about the federal army being tired of war, but they talk about a lie so base that *soldiers* do not notice it. We are in the army, and will remain in it until the American Union rests in peace, triumphant over the rebellious States, and traitors hanged, whether North or South."

Colonel Leggett, of the Seventy-eighth Ohio, a bitter democrat, writes:

"I entered the military service to aid in restoring and sustaining the integrity and unity of my government. For that object I have fought and bled, and for that I am still willing to fight and bleed, and no blunder or mistakes upon the part of the President can justify me in withdrawing from the army, while the enemies of the government are in arms against it."

From Indiana soldiers, too, there is a cry against Indiana copperheads.

General Milroy (democrat) and his staff write to Indianapolis:

"Any man or set of men, who, in times like these, when our government is engaged in a deadly struggle for its existence—a struggle which involves not only the fate of free government in our own country, but for all the world—would attempt to disgrace and prostitute the name of democrat by organizing a party under that name to oppose the government and divide and distract the people of the loyal States, are traitors much meaner than those in arms who boldly and directly seek the destruction of the government, for these pretended democrats sneakingly and indirectly seek the same end by exciting prejudice against the government and division among the people."

General Hovey and his Indiana Colonels stationed at Helena, Arkansas, have issued an address to the democrats of Indiana, warning them against showing favor to the peace-plots of schemers. They express themselves with soldierly indignation:

"What! admit that we are whipped? That twenty-three millions of northern men are unequal to nine millions of the South? Shame on the State that would entertain so disgraceful a proposition! Shame upon the democrat who

vould submit to it, and raise his cowardly voice, nd claim that he was an Indianan! In this ark hour of our country's trial, there is but one oad to success and peace, and that is, to be as rmly united for our government as the rebels re against it. Small differences of opinion mount to nothing in this grand struggle for a ation's existence. Do not place even one straw n the way, and remember that every word you peak to encourage the South, nerves the arm hat strikes the blow which is aimed at the eart's blood of our brothers and kindred."

They tell their fellow-citizens that

"The rebels of the South are leaning on the orthern democracy for support, and it is unques-ionably true that unjustifiable opposition to the Administration is giving aid and comfort to 'the nemy.'"

They say:

"The name of democrat, associated with all hat is bright and glorious in the history of the ast, is being sullied and disgraced by dema-ogues who are appealing to the lowest preju-ices and passions of our people. We have othing to expect from the South, and nothing to ope without their conquest. They are now sing their money freely to subsidize the press nd politicians of the North, and with what effect he tone of some of our journals and the speeches f some of our leaders testify."

And they add:

"Indiana's proud and loyal legions number at east seventy thousand effective men in the field, nd with one great heart we know that they vould repudiate all unholy combinations tending o the dismemberment of our government."

A soldier writes to the Chicago *Tribune*, from ne battle-field of Murfreesboro':

"What else was the *animus* of the Indiana res-lutions than a mockery of the memory of the ndiana dead?

"The first greetings to our great but dearly ought victory at Murfreesboro' were cowardly ries for 'peace.' While we were gathering to-ather the mutilated bodies of our brave boys, nd tenderly placing them in rude fashioned raves in the field where they nobly fell, mem-ers of a legislative body in the North were re-olving an epitaph for their State's fallen braves, nd the sum of their resolving might truthfully e read thus:

"Here Lies a Fellow,
Whose Mistaken Zeal for his Country's Integrity and Honor
Caused him to Unconstitutionally Slay
Our Dear Down-trodden Southern Brethren, in an Unholy Cause."

A formal address of "The Soldiers of Indiana to the Citizens of Indiana" says:

"We expect to come home some day. We will either come triumphantly rejoicing over the accomplishment of the object for which we have already endured so much, or we will come humiliated and dishartened at our defeat, and the consequent desolation of our country and our homes. In either event we will remember and honor those who have aided and encouraged us by their influence at home, and will visit those who have sought to defeat us with a retribution proportionate to the extent of the evil they have brought upon us and our country."

Colonel C. L. Dunham, commanding the Second Indiana Brigade, writes from Jackson, Tenn., 4th inst., to Governor Morton:

"Vigorous measures must be adopted, or our army, under the influence of the scoundrels and traitors at home who are, by their letters, scattering discontent among our soldiers, will be demoralized and destroyed, and the scourge of this war will, in less than six months, be rolled back upon the fair fields of our glorious Northwest.

"These men know not what they do, and if they expect any general sympathy in the army they are reckoning without their host."

It is, however, in Illinois, that the copperheads have been busiest in their work of treachery, and it is accordingly from Illinois soldiers that we have the most abundant testimony of unflinching loyalty and determination. Thus, on the 30th of January, a meeting of Illinois officers was called at Corinth, and adopted "resolutions to show to Governor Yates and the other State officers of Illinois, and to all our friends at home, that we are still in favor of the vigorous prosecution of the war, and that we will uphold our President and Governor in all their efforts to put down this rebellion."

The third resolution reads thus:

"*Resolved*, That we have watched the traitorous conduct of those members of the legislature of the State of Illinois, who, misrepresenting their constituency, have been proposing a cessation of the war, avowedly to arrange terms of peace, but really to give time for the exhausted rebels to recover strength and renew their plotting to divest Governor Yates of the rights and authority vested in him by our State constitution and laws; and to them we calmly and firmly say: *Beware of the terrible retribution that is falling upon your coadjutors at the South, and that, as your crime is tenfold blacker, it will swiftly smite you with tenfold more horror, should you persist in you damnable deeds of treason.*"

And the fifth reads thus:

"*Resolved*, That we hold in detestation, and will ever execrate any man who, in this struggle for our national life, offers factious opposition to either the federal or state authorities, in their efforts or measures for the vigorous prosecution of the war for the suppression of this godless rebellion."

On motion, it was decided to have a copy of the resolutions sent to the commanding officer of each Illinois regiment in the district, to be read at dress parade, and to be voted upon by the men of each regiment.

Certificates from the commanding officers of the Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Twelfth, Fiftieth, Fifty-second, Fifty-seventh, Sixty-second and Sixty-sixth Illinois regiments, show that the resolutions were thus read and unanimously adopted by the men.

At a meeting of the officers of the Sixty-second Illinois regiment, Colonel James M. True in the chair, this resolution was adopted:

"*Resolved*, That we denounce the wickedness and baseness of those citizens of the North who, by disloyal speeches and otherwise, impart confidence and hope to rebels in arms against their government; who encourage Union soldiers to desert, and threaten armed resistance to their recovery; and who, by letters, speeches, or acts, endeavor to promote disaffection in the army, the last hope of the nation; that we appeal to our fathers, our brothers, and our friends at home to discountenance, oppose, and put down those base and infamous wretches, who, while breathing the free air of Illinois, sympathize with treason and denounce the government which has given them peace and security, with liberty, from their childhood, now struggling almost in a death agony, and who, from motives of ambition, or for their own personal aggrandizement or advantage, would lend their aid, however indirectly, to reduce Illinois to the unhappy situation of the rebel Southern States, the seat of blighting and desolating war."

At another meeting of Illinois troops, a series of resolutions were adopted, of which this is one:

"*Resolved*, That we hereby proclaim to the world our undying love of the Union of States, and, at the same time, our eternal and everlasting abhorrence for traitors, whether found in armed rebellion at the South, or in disloyal conventions and legislatures North."

From the Forty-sixth Illinois regiment, stationed at Moscow, Tennessee, comes the following, in a letter to the Dixon (Illinois) *Telegraph*, dated January 29:

"We hate those villians and traitors who are afraid that the rebels will be hurt or deprived of their property, and would rather shoot them than southern traitors. We are surprised that men should be allowed to put forth such resolutions as those lately passed in Springfield, and if the black-hearted cowards who put them forth think they have friends in the army, they are sadly deceived. Dark and dispiriting as the future looks, we are still ready to fight traitors; and when those in the South are put down, we want a chance at those detestable and cowardly ones in the North. General Grant's army was never in better fighting trim than at present, and if the traitors of Illinois will come down here, it will do its utmost to exterminate them with their brother rebels."

The Thirteenth Illinois, from their camp in the field before Vicksburg, sent a bugle blast against the peace traitors at home, under date of February 10th. They specifically range themselves on the side of the President, though they say many of them opposed his election, and they add:

"That we firmly and cordially endorse the President's Proclamation emancipating the slaves of rebels, thereby depriving them of one of their greatest elements of strength, and we will, to the best of our ability, aid in the execution and enforcement of the same.

"That any person or newspaper uttering or publishing opinions that the army of Illinois, in the field, are anxious to quit the service and return to their homes, on account of the policy of the President, utter his or their own sentiments, which we consider disloyal, and a libel upon the feelings of the army.

"That we are unconditionally opposed to any armistice or convention having for its object any compromise or settlement of the difficulties now existing between the United States and the traitors in arms, except on unconditional submission to the laws which they have, without cause, so wickedly violated."

The following was adopted unanimously (except one vote) and enthusiastically, by Colonel Niles' regiment, the One Hundred and Thirtieth Illinois, at Fort Pickering, Memphis, on the 11th of February:

"*Resolved*, That we, soldiers of Illinois, in arms in the face of the enemy, have nothing now to do with politics, or political discussions, nor

any desire to mingle in them; we wish and intend to do our duty as soldiers. With the policy of the Administration and its head, Abraham Lincoln, our Commander-in-Chief, we have nothing to do. Our oaths bind us to obey his orders, and the orders of the officers appointed over us, and to bear true allegiance to the United States. Our oaths we will keep, so help us God! But while we deny not the right and duty of political discussion to those who have the time and opportunity therefor, we protest with all the energy and vehemence of our natures, and with all the patriotism of our hearts, we inveigh and protest against surrender or retreat, and against any armistice, or truce, or peace, or compromise, with traitors in arms; and we here solemnly resolve that we will hold that man as a traitor, and an eternal enemy to us, to our children, and to our country, who shall propose, or has proposed, any settlement by which the rebellion shall be screened from just punishment, and the country and her defenders cheated of the fruits of past victories and present triumph. Our labors, blood, and treasures shall not be spent in vain."

General John A. Logan, of Illinois, a democrat of the straitest sect, when he heard of the action of the Illinois Legislature, wrote:

"Tell them up North, for me, that we can whip the rebels and are going to do it; and when we are done, we are to return home. When we get there, we shall yet be strong enough to summarily punish any secession sympathizers or peace preachers that we may be able to find in our way"

Colonel Frank Sherman wrote on the 14th instant, from the Camp on Stone River, Tennesse:

"Let the disunionists of the North take heed. We do not propose quietly to allow them to trample on our rights, and help to dig our graves. What we expect and look for is that men will not long be allowed to utter traitors' sentiments at our homes; that there is true patriotism enough left to save the country, and rub out traitors of all degrees at home, in the guise of loyalty, to whatever party they may belong. Every officer and soldier that I have talked with in regard to our duty, agrees with me, that we will sustain to the death our Commander-in-Chief, the President of the United States, in all measures and orders that he may issue for the crushing of the rebellion in the Southern States."

"G. H., Co. A, 2d Illinois Cavalry," writes from Memphis, February 7th, about the copperheads:

"I say that all such men ought to be made to leave the country or be hung. This is the way the Southerners do, even with harmless Union men in the South, and sure our cause is much more valuable than theirs. I say, as General Hurlbut said in his late speech, 'that the copperheads create a very bad influence in our glorious army.' I say they ought, at least, to be made to hold their tongues, even if it cost a 'free fight' in the North. I think that a great injustice was done when the army was not allowed to vote in the different elections since the commencement of this war. Through this the traitors of the North are daily venturing to show themselves."

An officer in General Rosecrans' army says:

"Woe betide the secession sympathizers and would-be peace-makers when the army get through with their present work on hand. The sufferings, deprivations, and hardships of soldier-life are not so easily endured, and the cause we are fighting for is too dear to be broken down by the cowards and stay-at-homes who brought on the war, and now place every impediment in the way of having accomplished what must be the inevitable result—the subjugation of the rebellion. Curses loud and deep go out every day from men and officers, and they are not to be lightly thought of. Now and then you can hear the names of some marked men, whose life or lives are pledged for a rope or bullet. All in good time and they will get them."

Of the feeling in the army of General Rosecrans, a correspondent of the St. Louis *Democrat* writes:

"I have made it my business to talk with and find out the general sentiment of the army in regard to this new phase of disloyalty, and on no subject have I found the whole army so unanimous as in their bitter denunciation of such traitors as Goudy and Merrick, and the rest of the party that organized that traitorous meeting in the very capital of the State which has sent its hundred and fifty thousand men to fight the battles of the Government. Officers and men denounce them alike. I have heard hundreds of men say that the war on secessionists was not (with them) confined to the South; that here they had acquired the habit of destroying the property and taking the lives of traitors, and that they did not think they could leave off the habit when they got home."

In Leavenworth, Kansas, the brave General Blunt made a speech on the 14th instant, in which he said:

"Fellow-citizens: I have some little respect for a man who believes his cause to be just, and who fights to sustain it. But the most detestable men on earth are the consummate cowards who

lack the courage to shoulder a musket and go inside the rebel lines, but who stay at home and fire in the rear of the men who are defending your homes and your country.

"I have yet to see the first soldier who is tired of this war, or disposed to end it without the unconditional submission of the rebels. [Applause.] The men are all right, and they are not at all fastidious about having the nigger to help them. Wherever I have heard any objection to rebels being killed by negroes, I have always noticed that it came from some fool in shoulder-straps."

And no sooner is a copperhead nominated for Governor in Connecticut than Connecticut soldiers begin to speak out.

A letter from Colonel William G. Ely, of the Eighteenth Connecticut regiment, denounces the copperheads of his native State:

"I am surprised that the people of Connecticut are becoming contaminated with the fickle and cowardly spirit now manifested in various sections. Let the people of the North shrink from the contest in which we are now engaged, and bitter will be their disappointment.

"In place of thanks from the thousands of soldiers now in the field, for the withdrawal of their support to this war, the curses of the brave will ring in their ears, demanding, Why do you insult us by doubting our ability? What revenge have we for our comrades slain?"

The following extract from a private letter, written by a member of Company H, Twelfth Connecticut regiment, to a friend in Collinsville, puts the matter in its true light:

"Have you any secesh scamps among you who are prating of compromise? If you have, do, for God's sake, give them a rifle and turn them over to Jeff. Davis, for they cannot then do the harm they are doing now. There is no one who desires peace more than I do, but as long as the rebels are in arms, and as long as any flag other than the Stars and Stripes waves in this country, I say fight them!"

HEADQUARTERS 54TH ILLS. VOL. INF'Y.,
Jackson, Tenn., Feb. 16, 1863.

CAPT. REED—*Sir:* The above resolutions were adopted unanimously, with the exception of the one opposing an armistice, to which there were ten dissenting voices. The following additional one was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That we, as citizens soldiers of Illinois, sent forth to sustain the Government and laws of the United States, under which our beloved State has so rapidly advanced in population, wealth, and intelligence, unanimously declare our confidence in the ability, honesty, and patriotism of our Governor, Hon. Richard Yates, and pledge him our cordial support against all who shall attempt to mislead the State from her allegiance to the Union, or stain her fair fame with the crime of treason.

G. M. MITCHELL,
Colonel 54th Illinois Volunteer Infantry.

HEADQUARTERS 18TH REG'T ILL. INF'Y,
Jackson, Tenn., Feb. 16, 1863.

CAPT. REED—*Sir:* I presented the resolutions to the officers and soldiers of the 18th Illinois Volunteers this evening, and it gives me pleasure to say that they were adopted with but three dissenting votes. The following additional one was also adopted:

Resolved, That we approve of each and every act of the Administration designed to crush the rebellion; and we furthermore pledge ourselves to sustain the Commander-in-Chief of the army and navy of the United States in any and all efforts he may make within the pale of civilized warfare to conquer the rebels, and certify by this resolve that we ignore politics and party, and recognize nothing but our country.

E. B. MARKS,
Major Commanding Regiment.

HEADQUARTERS 14TH OHIO BATTERY,
Jackson, Tenn., Feb. 14, 1863.

CAPT. REED—*Sir:* The foregoing preamble and resolutions are heartily and unanimously endorsed by the enlisted men of the 14th Ohio Battery.

Lieut. HOMER H. STULL,
Commanding Battery.
Lieut. HAMILTON H. BURROWS,
Lieut. SETH. M. LAIRD.

HEADQUARTERS 14TH INDIANA BATTERY,
Jackson, Tenn., Feb. 14, 1863.

CAPT. C. H. REED—*Sir:* The following preamble and resolutions were adopted with but four dissenting voices, by the officers and men of the 14th Indiana Battery, at Jackson, Tenn., together with the following additional resolution:

Resolved, That we heartily condemn the action of our State Legislature in its efforts to embarrass the Government and render aid to treason, thereby prolonging the war, and making more bloody and desperate the struggle for the preservation of our Government; and that we trust the good people of the Hoosier State may frown down the late proceedings of this treasonable conclave, and at the earliest moment replace them with good and loyal men.

F. W. MOORE,
1st Lieut. Commanding Battery.

HEADQUARTERS 11TH ILLINOIS CAVALRY,
Jackson, Tenn., Feb. 11, 1863.

CAPT. REED—*Sir:* The above resolutions were this day read in presence of the regiment, and were cordially approved without a dissenting voice.

BASIL D. MEEK,
Lieut.-Col. Commanding Regiment.

HEADQUARTERS 3D MICHIGAN, CAVALRY,
Camp near Jackson, Tenn., Feb. 11, 1863.

CAPT. REED—*Sir:* The enclosed resolutions, together with the one last appended, were unanimously adopted by the members of the 3d Michigan Cavalry.

Additional resolution adopted by the 3d Michigan Cavalry:

Resolved, That, in our judgment, the partisan spirit exhibited at the North at the present time, is suicidal to the best interests of our Government, and should meet the unqualified disapprobation of every true patriot; and that we call upon loyal men who love their country, by the sacred tie that binds them to *liberty*, the Union, and the *Constitution*, by the veneration due the patriots who have bequeathed to us this noble inheritance, and the solemn duties we owe posterity, to desist from recriminations and wrangling among themselves, and to unite in the sacred cause of *liberty*, against the enemies of civilization and humanity, and to present an unbroken front to this wicked rebellion.

Very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
G. MOYER,
Lieut. Col. Commanding 3d Michigan Cavalry.

HEADQUARTERS 7TH WISCONSIN BATTERY,
Jackson, Tenn., Feb. 14, 1863.

CAPT. REED—*Sir:* At a meeting of the officers and members of the 7th Winconsin Battery, the above resolutions were unanimously adopted.

G. E. GREEN,
1st Lieut. Commanding 7th Wisconsin Battery.

OFFICE OF CHIEF OF HOSPITALS,
Jackson, Tenn., Feb. 12, 1863.

CAPT. REED—*Sir:* The sense of the patients in the United States General Hospitals having been obtained by the different Ward-masters, is found to be nearly unanimously in favor of the above resolutions, there being but six dissenting voices out of 589 patients.

Respectfully,
EDWARD L. RITTOE,
Chief of Hospitals.

HEADQUARTERS 2D BRIGADE,
District of Jackson,
Camp Reed, February 17, 1863.

CAPT. REED—*Sir:* I have the pleasure to say, that at a meeting of the regiments of this brigade consisting of the 50th Indiana, 103d Illinois, and 27th Iowa, they have unanimously passed the resolutions referred to them. The 50th Indiana also unanimously adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That we are for our government however administered. We will sustain the one now and regulate the other when we get home.

JOHN K. SIMPSON,
Acting Assistant Adjutant General.

All papers throughout the Northwest that are desirous of letting the public know the true sentiments of the soldiers of this command are requested to copy these resolutions.

Very respectfully,
C. H. REED,
Capt. Co. E, 18th Reg. Ill. Vol. Infantry.

FROM JACKSON, TENN.

Plain Talk About Northern Traitors—What the Soldiers Say.

[Correspondence of the Missouri Democrat.]

JACKSON, Tenn., Feb. 17, 1863.

The indignant feeling of the army, in relation to the doings of Northern traitors, is constantly widening and deepening. The regiments composing the division of the gallant General J. C. Sullivan are all sound to the core. The exclusion of the Chicago *Times* from this district is universally approved, and no tears would be shed (except by secesh citizens) if all kindred papers were served in the same way.

The resolutions I send herewith have been unanimously adopted by the regiments of this command. We plainly tell gentlemen of the copperhead persuasion that a day of retribution is coming. They may attack us in the rear, now, and *bruise our heels*, but the day is coming when we will turn upon them and *bruise their heads*.

Several days ago the above resolutions were submitted to each company of the 103d Regiment Illinois Volunteers, giving the men ample time to consider them and vote intelligently. Yesterday the regiment turned out under arms, held an enthusiastic Union meeting, and adopted the resolutions without a dissenting voice. The other regiments in this vicinity have pursued a like course, with a like result. 'Tis the unanimous expression of army opinion.

W. S. PETERSON,
Chaplain 103d Regt. Ill. Vol.

No Sympathy with the Copperheads.

Expressions from Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, and Wisconsin Soldiers.

THE TRUE METAL!

JACKSON, Tenn., Feb. 13, 1863.

Editors Missouri Democrat:

You will confer a favor upon the public, and also upon the soldiers of this command, by publishing the following resolutions. We wish to let our friends at home know what our real sentiments are as soldiers, and correct a false impression put forth by demagogues:

WHEREAS, the Government of the United States is engaged in a just and righteous war to crush armed rebellion and restore peace and unity to our country; and

WHEREAS, a few demagogues have obtained place and power under false pretenses in some of the Northern States, are openly exhibiting their sympathy with traitors, and doing all they can to trammel, discourage and defeat the Government of the United States; and

WHEREAS, it has been claimed by some of these demagogues, that they have the sympathy and co-operation of the soldiers in the field, thereby disheartening the friends and encouraging the enemies of the Union: therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government which was bequeathed to us by the patriots of "'76," to establish which "they pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honors," is fully worthy of the same pledge and sacrifice on our part for its maintenance and preservation.

Resolved, That while we deplore the consequences of civil war, we, nevertheless, wage it in a spirit of ardent patriotism and reverence for the memory and blood of our fathers, and proclaim the earnestness of our purpose, our conviction of the justice of our cause, and our determination not to lay down our arms, until the integrity of the Government and the supremacy of the Constitution are fully and unequivocally recognized.

Resolved, That we are unalterably opposed to any armistice or cessation of hostilities until those in rebellion against the Government of the United States shall desist from their rebellion, and manifest an honorable desire to return to their allegiance to that government.

Resolved, That we denounce in the strongest terms those who by their disloyal speeches, writings, and acts are giving encouragement to the rebels we are fighting, and endeavoring to create dissatisfaction in our ranks; and trusting to the patriotism of the people of the Northwest, we appeal to them to denounce and put down the demagogues thus engaged.

A SOLDIER ON THE PEACE QUESTION.

STRONG LETTER FROM BRIGADIER-GENERAL NEGLEY.

The following are extracts from a private letter written by Brigadier-General NEGLEY, of the Army of the Cumberland.

CAMP AT MURFREESBORO', Tenn.,
Sunday, Feb. 15th, 1863.

DEAR SIR: If ever I felt a blush of shame and anger against citizens of my native State, it was when I learned of this shameless party strife, aiming to secure a cessation of hostilities; an offer of the olive-branch of peace to the traitors who have insulted our national traditions, trampled upon the graves of our revolutionary fathers, sacked our public treasury and armories, robbed commerce of its honor, violated the sacred pledges of representatives, hurled brands of discord into our councils, let loose the bitter water of strife in our social circles, and prostituting every manly and womanly sentiment to the hellish purpose of destroying our Government. Have they not maltreated our wounded, robbed our prisoners, and outraged the dead? Have they not broken every compact for the amelioration of the horrors of war? Have they not exiled thousands from their own fireside to perish or to live like wild beasts in the mountains? Who will dare to deny that they have not committed all these barbarities?

Yet, in view of all these facts, miserable, shameless demagogues, cowardly traitors at home, seek to force the Government into an unholy alliance with those perfidious people. Why should there be an effort made to shield the Southern traitors from suffering the full penalty of their crimes? Do the deserve it? Is it not the legitimate fruits of treason and rebellion? Let no peace, no prosperity, no safety dwell in their lands, until they lay down their arms and acknowledge the Government they are endeavoring to destroy. If war in terrible earnest cannot conquer a peace, what can? If the resources of a mighty people, and the determined energy and bravery of great armies, contending for their birthright, cannot crush this mushroom Confederacy, what can? Will it be by dishonoring ourselves in humbly craving their submission, and appealing to them to restore the Government?

No, they would answer your appeal with the thunder of artillery, and treat your submission with defiant scorn. No, let it be spoken in the councils of the aged, and taught in the lessons of our youth, that the honor and integrity of our Union "must and shall be preserved," and that the penalty of treason is death.

Yours truly,

JAMES S. NEGLEY,
Brigadier-General.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

No. 6.

NORTHERN TRUE MEN

AND

SOUTHERN TRAITORS.

ADDRESS AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONNECTICUT SOLDIERS.

EXTRACTS FROM RICHMOND JOURNALS.

NEW YORK:
LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY.
1863.

FELLOW-CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT;

The following letters are addressed to each of us individually; read them carefully, they are the voices of our sons, brothers, and neighbors, speaking to us. They are not the words of strangers, but of those we have daily associated with and known long and intimately. They ask, "are you, who bid us God speed as we went forth from among you, to uphold the honor of our State and fight the battles of our Country, now willing to forsake and disown us? Is the blood of our companions in arms, that they have shed in their struggles to maintain the Union and crush this accursed Rebellion, a thing of so little value in your sight, that you are ready to cry for quarters when the rebels are nearly exhausted and will soon be flying before our victorious armies? Will you cast your votes for men that you well know have rejoiced at our defeats and mourned over our victories? Will you elect men to represent us and you in the councils of our nation, and to fill the posts of honor in our State, who will, as a reward for all we have done and suffered, say to us, 'this is a most unjust and unholy war that you are engaged in; the graves of your companions in arms who have fallen, are but evidences of their and your fanaticism?'" Freemen of Connecticut! this appeal is to us, shall we disregard it? Shall we, by our votes, place the control of our State affairs in men who are extending the right hand of fellowship to grasp the traitor hand that is now striking to destroy our national existence and is daily crimsoned with the warm life-blood of the sons of our native State? Shall "our soldiers" as they read the result of the election at home, have cause to blush that they are the sons of Connecticut? or shall they be able to point proudly at the record of her unwavering loyalty, and feel that they have the hearty support and approval of those at home? With us who remain at home rest the responsibility. It is for us to say whether the verdict shall go forth to the world endorsed by us, "the North has lost heart and is divided, the strength and stability of the Government is daily weakening, never to be revived; the rebels in the South can never be conquered;" or whether we will, forgetting all our minor differences of opinion, unite in the firm determination to support the Government, and give the lie to the base slander that Connecticut is disloyal. Let us never suffer the flag that our brave volunteers have so nobly sustained at Newbern, at Pulaski, at Antietam, to be lowered by traitor hands at home, and the white flag of cowards and peace men to be planted over the soil where reposes the ashes of so many brave and noble men who have fallen fighting the battles of their country. Let us say to traitors in the South and to their sympathisers at the North, we will not have peace if it is to be purchased at the price of our national greatness; our motto is, "the Union must and shall be preserved," and we will not vote for any man or set of men that have not given the strongest proof that they will support the Government with vigor, fidelity, and zeal, in its efforts to crush the Rebellion.

THE LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

RESOLUTION PASSED FEBRUARY 14, 1863.

Resolved, That the object of this organization is, and shall be confined to the distribution of Journals and Documents of unquestionable and unconditional loyalty throughout the United States, and particularly in the Armies now engaged in the suppression of the Rebellion; and to counteract, as far as practicable, the efforts now being made by the enemies of the Government and the advocates of a disgraceful peace to circulate journals and documents of a disloyal character.

President, CHARLES KING.
Secretary, JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS, Jr.
BOX 3842, N. Y. POST OFFICE.
Treasurer, MORRIS KETCHUM.

ROOMS, 863 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

All persons interested in the objects expressed in the above Resolutions are requested to send their contributions to the Treasurer. All willing to aid in the circulation of the Documents may address the Secretary.

VOICE OF NORTHERN TRUE MEN.

The Seventh Connecticut.

To Our Friends at Home: The undersigned members of the 7th Connecticut Volunteers beg leave to express to their fellow-citizens at home their views in regard to the prosecuting of the war in which we are engaged. Prevented from uttering our sentiments at the ballot-box, we yet feel more intensely than ever before for the welfare of the ancient Commonwealth, of whose name and fame we were never more proud than while beholding, for the past two years, her unwearied and wise patriotism, and her parental care for her sons in arms.

When we left our homes the resolve was unanimous among our fellow-citizens to defend, to the last extremity, the perpetuity of the Union, the liberties of our country, and the safety of our homes; and we felt secure in leaving the honor and welfare of the State in the keeping of those who did not go forth to battle. Since then, unhappily, some men have arisen, it is hoped not many, who demand that the war should be brought to an immediate and unconditional close, and that peace should be obtained upon any terms. They urge their demand, among other pretenses, on the ground of compassion for us. They represent that we have become discouraged with the length of the war, and wearied of its toils and sufferings; that we behold, with factious discontent, the measures of those in authority; that we desire, above all else and at any terms, peace, and our return to our homes, and that to secure such a peace is an act of duty and friendship to us. Thus misrepresented in our absence, we feel called on to declare the falseness of these statements. We are not discouraged. If disheartened at all, it is not by the force of the enemy, but by the divisions and irresoluteness of our people at home, and the readiness of so many to make money and gain office out of the distress of the country. We do not deem it our place to criticise the acts of the Government or of our superior officers. We have always offered an unhesitating obedience to the command of constituted and constitutional authorities. We are not tired of the toils and sacrifices of a soldier's life. If we were disposed for a moment to grow weary, we should be rebuked by a voice from the graves of our comrades, who have laid down their lives uncomplainingly for the liberty of the Union. We are ready to share the honored graves of those that sleep on Tybee and James Island and beside the Pocotaligo, rather than that a base, degrading peace should mock the sacrifices that have been made, and the blood that has been spilled. We look on him as our enemy who would seek to recall us by a peace which would embitter our homes with a sense of degradation, and which would soon be broken up by a war which would compel us to take the field again under circumstances vastly more arduous and discouraging even than now. We shall never cease to remember with indignation those who avail themselves of our absence to betray and disgrace the interests for which we are periling our all. People of Connecticut, we have carried your banner beside the Stars and Stripes; we unfolded it within the captured fortress of Pulaski; we gathered our shattered and bleeding ranks around it before the batteries of James Island, till the flag was thoroughly riddled, and the staff that supported it was shot off; we carried it at our front when we drove the enemies of our country through the waters of the Pocotaligo, and amid every reverse and every toil we have been cheered by remembering that its folds were never associated with disgrace. Let us not now, for the first time, be compelled to feel that the State under whose ensign we march has failed in the hour of trial to be faithful to the Union, to Liberty, and to duty.

Fellow-citizens of New Haven county, remember your own Hitchcock, who fell so nobly; and our adopted citizen, the lion-hearted William Kay, who, with his wounds yet unhealed, hastened to another and fatal field of battle. Citizens of Hartford county, recall to mind Upson and William Soby and Francis Brainard. Men of Litchfield county, remember Palmer, the idol of

his home and his command, and Sergt. Reynolds. People of Windham county, remember your own Hibbard and Corbin. Citizens of Fairfield county, do not forget Starr and the brave Thomas Hooton, and Holmes dying a prisoner and wounded, and Eaton and Cook. Men of New London county, remember Joab Jeffrey. Remember those, your brothers and ours, and a multitude beside, and for God's sake do not dishonor their fresh graves by declaring that they died in a fool's cause, in a cause that is not worth the expenditure of time and money and life.

Speaking not as partisans nor in behalf of any party (for in such an hour we lay aside all divisions of party, and we remember only America and the Union), we appeal to you, our brethren, at home, in whose hands Providence has placed the honor and the destiny of our State for the coming year, and we entreat you to give your votes to no party or persons who would purchase peace by conditions dishonoring and debasing. Rather, we implore you, to elevate to office men who, regardless of party or personal interests, will discharge their duties to the Republic —men who, while encouraging to the last the resources of the State, and cherishing tenderly the lives, the happiness, and the health of her armed sons, will yet feel that no necessary expenditure of toil, or money, or life, should be withheld in order to secure the objects for which we have enlisted—to preserve the principles of the Constitution—to put down an unspeakably wicked Rebellion—to deliver our nation from interminable division and warfare—to restore a firm Union —to secure to all coming generations the priceless blessings of peace and liberty, purchased with blood, secured by law, and crowned by the favor and blessings of Almighty God.

Fernandina, Fla., March 14, 1863.

Col. Joseph R. Hawley, Major D. C. Rodman, Surgeon G. C. Jarvis, First Assistant-Surgeon Horace P. Porter, Second Assistant-Surgeon E. C. Hine, R. Q. M. Wm. T. Seward, Chaplain H. L. Wayland; Capt. V. P. Chamberlain, Co. A; Second Lieutenant J. Van Keuren, Co. A; Capt. Theodore Bendick, Co. B; Second Lieut. John H. Wilson, Co. B; Capt. O. S. Sanford, Co. C; Second Lieut. John J. Hutchinson, Co. C; Capt. Benjamin F. Skinner, Co. D; Second Lieut. Theodore C. Wildman, Co. D; Capt. James A. Binns, Co. E; First Lieut. Robert Dempsey, Co. E; Second Lieut. D. S. Coe, Co. E; First Lieut. S. S. Atwell, Co. F; Second Lieut. Charles E. Barker, Co. F; Capt. Charles C. Mills, Co. G; First Lieut. Jeremiah Townsend, Co. G; Second Lieut. Chas. A. Wood, Co. G; Capt. J. Ben. Dennis, Co. H; First Lieut. Edward S. Perry, Co. H; Second Lieut. Wm. S. Marble, Co. H; Capt. Sylvester H. Gray, Co. I; First Lieut. Ira E. Hick, Co. B; Second Lieut. E. C. Jordon, Co. I; Capt. Jerome Tourtellotte, Co. K; First Lieut. Wm. E. Phillips, Co. K; Second Lieut. Charles J. Greene, Co. K.

The Twelfth Connecticut.

ADDRESS OF THE OFFICERS OF THE TWELFTH CONNECTICUT REGIMENT TO THE PEOPLE OF THEIR NATIVE STATE.

RECORDS OF A MEETING OF THE OFFICERS *of the 12th Regiment Connecticut Volunteers, convened March 7, 1863, at Camp Reno, Brashear City, La.*

Present: Captains Lewis, Clark, Dickinson, DeForest, Braley, Granniss, Bixbee, Brennan, Chappell; Chaplain J. H. Bradford, Surgeon J. R. Cummings; Lieutenants Lowell, Hendrick, Ball, Bulkley, James E. Smith, Clark, Taintor, Allen, Crossman, Laurie, and Frank Smith, being all the officers not sick or absent on duty.

The meeting was organized by the appointment of Capt. Dickinson as President, and Lieut. Ball as Recorder.

It being proposed, in view of the treasonable or cowardly peace sentiments which have lately been promulgated at the North, that a patriotic address should be forwarded from the officers of the Regiment to the citizens of Connecticut, the ollowing was prepared, and, after due deliberation and discussion, was adopted without a dissenting voice:

THE ADDRESS.

We, the officers of the 12th Regiment Connecticut Volunteers, feel it our duty to address some earnest words of advice and warning to our brethren, the citizens of Connecticut.

In the midst of a heroic and hopeful struggle for our Nation's Unity, we are amazed by hearing from the lips of men, who have not yet looked in the face of battle, a dastardly cry for peace. We learn that the Legislatures of States, lately distinguished for the sublimest and most self-sacrificing patriotism, have suddenly shown a disposition to call for peace conventions, to beg an armistice of rebellion, to capitulate to treason. In a time thus corrupt, it is natural that we should be anxious concerning the course of Connecticut. Will she be recreant in the glorious contest, and "move to the rear to the sound of the enemy's cannon?" Or will she rather be what she was in the similarly noble strife of the Revolution—an unterrified and indefatigable combatant for our nationality? This is the question which you who remain at home will decide.

We call on you, across a thousand miles of hostile territory, to so decide it that we can look into the eyes of our Southern friends and our Southern foes without being ashamed because of you. We call on Connecticut citizens to be as brave by their fire-sides as they expect Connecticut soldiers to be on the battle-field.

Do not be deceived by ill-informed and ill-designing men, who cry "Peace! peace! when

there is no peace." We, who have been a year in the midst of treason, and who have bought our sad knowledge with our health and blood, are certain that we know the Rebels better than do those who have remained half a continent away from the scene of contest. It is not true that the men who are in arms against our Government are in favor of a pacific restoration of the Union. They are so blinded by ambition and jealousy and hate, that they desire anything rather than that. They are hard pressed, but they catch at every hope. They are extremely anxious for peace; but they are more anxious for independence.

There is but one way to bring them back to the Union; and that is to destroy their organized treason in the field.

Trust us when we assure you that this cry of Northern poltroons for peace does not conciliate the Rebels, but, on the contrary, gives them energy to continue the war. They now believe that, if they fight only a little longer, they will gain the victory through the disunion and discouragement of the loyal part of the nation. We beg of you not to strengthen thus the hearts and hands of our foemen. We implore you not to make yourselves guilty, even thus indirectly, of the blood of loyal Connecticut soldiers. When we face the Rebel cannon, we do not wish to see your masses behind them, giving them better support than that of their own infantry.

Do not be anxious to close the war from a mistaken sense of kindness to us. We would like to return home; but not until treason is crushed. We would like to become simply American citizens once more; but not until the title of American citizen has again become altogether honorable. And if Connecticut joins her voice with that of our enemies and the enemies of our country, we do not desire ever to tread her soil again.

Do not be perplexed because what was once a political dogma has been judged a military necessity, and our Commander-in-Chief, the President, has thought it wise to strike a blow at Slavery. Let traitors and Rebels defend this unprofitable, barbarous, undemocratic system of labor, if it seems to them their interest to do so. It is your interest and ours, your duty and ours, to defend only the American Union.

Are you at home under the delusion that in becoming soldiers we altogether ceased to be citizens? Are our rights as co-heirs in a freeman's heritage forfeited by our absence? The graves of our comrades, stricken by disease, or killed in battle, make sacred the soil of Louisiana. The war may call for the lives of many more of us. Years hence, if hostilities shall last so long, with what feelings will you expect the returned remnant of us to meet those men who, by their counsels of comfort to the enemy, shall have prolonged the war and made themselves parties to the murder of our brave comrades in arms? We are ready to fight treason wherever it may be found, in one State as uncompromisingly and sternly as another. Whether in Louisiana or Connecticut, we abhor it, and desire its destruction, and in so speaking we believe that we utter the feeling of the whole American army.

We learn by every mail of acts at the North as treasonable as that which in this State deservedly brought a Mumford to the gallows. We hear of public expressions of sentiments more disloyal than those which have made Ship Island a penal colony. Is it true that while Louisiana, repentant, is on her way back to the ranks of loyalty, Connecticut is preparing to desert to the ranks of treason?

Unless you look upon the offer of our health, our comforts, our ambitions, our lives even, as a thing to be spit upon, do not by every mail send us, through your newspapers and the reports of your public gatherings, expressions of your disapproval of the war, and so of the part which each of us is taking in it.

We address you thus early, fellow-citizens, because we fear that in your deliberations on this matter you may forget us, and the 20,000 other citizens in Connecticut who are now absent from their homes in defense of the nation's life and honor. We are confident that you have no right to disgrace us by calling for a cowardly peace, as we have no right to disgrace you by dastardly conduct on the battle-field.

Finally, we conjure you to resolve with us that this war shall never end but with the destruction of treason, and the waving of the Stars and Stripes over every foot of earth belonging to the United States.

Capt. L. A. Dickinson, President.
Lieut. Stephen Ball, Recorder.

VOICE OF SOUTHERN TRAITORS.

The Richmond Enquirer of the 5th has the following leader, which shows plainly how despondent are the unholy leaders of the Rebellion, who, at the outset, cheated their followers into the belief that their ends could be accomplished through treason at the North:

"PEACE."

From of old it was held perilous for men to cry Peace! peace! when there was no peace. The dangers of it for us at this moment are manifold. It encourages the planting of cotton instead of corn; it unsettles the minds of our soldiers in the field, which is demoralization; it stimulates the enemy to a more vigorous prosecution of the war by the idea that *we* are so tired of it.

There are some who reproach *The Enquirer* with being an advocate of war, and not of peace. This is somewhat unreasonable. Is any one offering us peace? Look round our whole horizon—*where* is it, on sea or land, that you discern any faintest flutter of the "white wings?" It is all war; all one bottomless gulf of blood, one universal carnival of slaughter, and ravage and ruin.

True, there is one way by which the Southern Confederates could immediately regain all the blessings of peace; it is by submission—by reconstruction—by desisting from the "Rebellion," and delivering up our ring-leaders to the punishment of the laws that they have trampled upon. Is there, indeed, one single citizen of this Confederacy who would have peace at any price? Well, here is the price; say at once—are we to pay it?

But the symptoms of a breach between the East and Northwest? May not they be managed and turned to account, perhaps? Why "repel" the Northwest by harsh and cutting language? Truly, we admit that language is a very inadequate weapon against those armed and brutal invaders; they would never be "repelled" by vituperative epithet; and all the bayonets and columbiads we can muster are scarcely enough to repel the brigands. But let us help and encourge, you say, their intestine divisions. Yes, we are willing; in the way we gave rise to those divisions at first, we wish to encourage them now. That is to say, by desperate resistance and defiance.

To be plain, we fear and distrust far more these apparently friendly advances of the Democrats than the open atrocity of philanthropists of Massachusetts. That Democratic party always was our worst enemy; and but for its poisonous embrace these States would have been free and clear of the unnatural Union twenty years ago. It is not the Sewards and Sumners, the Black Republicans and Abolitionists, who have hurt us. They were right all along; there *was* an irrepressible conflict; between two different civilizations, two opposite social organizations; they were no more able to live peaceably together in one government than two hands can wear one glove. If we did not discover so soon as the Abolitionists this great truth, it was because the Democratic party, neutral as it was in principle, false to both sides, and wholly indifferent to the *morale* of either of the opposing communities, placed itself between, raised the banner of "spoils," and—we all know the rest. The idea of that odious party coming to life again, and holding out its arms to us, makes us shiver. Its foul breath is malaria; its touch is death.

Give us the open foeman; let him be as ferocious and greedy as he will. Let our enemy appear as an exterminating Yankee host, we pray, and not as a Democratic Convention. Let him take any shape but that! Already we have visions of the men of feeble knees, tender feet, and undulating spines, losing their sense and manhood by the contact, as they did, alas! so often before. We scent from afar off the old dead compromises—*absit omen!*—and seem to feel upon our throats the strangulation of unclean fingers. But it is a dream; nobody lives in this Confederacy who will dare to propose, or to hint even at a distance, that we should sacrifice at that abominable shrine all the gallant blood freely poured out to sanctify our nationhood. For it comes to this: we can have no peace now, save by submission; no peace now save by making once more an affiliation with a Northern party, and making the Democracy a present of all that inestimable treasure of the dearest blood that flowed in Southern veins.

Peace! Does the monstrous host before Vicksburg bring us peace? Is it peace that Rosecrans is making in Tennessee? Does the military dispersion of public meetings in Kentucky bode peace? The now Northern conscription, enrolling three millions, and making provision for instantly commanding their service, or exacting a heavy exemption tax—does this look like peace? The deliberate vesting in Abraham Lincoln of all the military power of a dictator, with the treasure of the whole nation opened to him without stint—is it to enable him to make peace or war—which?

Where, then, are those indications of peace which we are said to be recklessly resisting and disdaining? Oh! the great speech of Vallandigham; the touching invitation of tuneful Cox!

We greatly fear that those two wooers of the South, so fond and fair, will very soon be found, like John Van Buren, shrieking out for war to the knife; and if they delay or decline to recant their great and noble peace speeches, why, they will see the inside of Lincoln's jails. We wish from our hearts they were both already safely chained up at the present writing; they have done us more harm, they and their like, than ten thousand Sewards and Sumners. We tremble to see their unwholesome advances; still more to see a sort of morbid craving here to respond to them, under the delusive idea of promoting intestine division at the North.

Oh! Dictator Lincoln! lock ye up those two peace Democrats—together with Richardson—in some of your military prisons!

The Duty of the Northwest.

From The Richmond Whig, March 16.

Never were States in a more critical condition than those the Northwest are at this moment. Their fate hangs embling in the balance, and not an hour is to be lost if ey would decide their destiny as freemen. Ten millions people, composed in great part of men of Southern na- ity or extraction, and inhabiting as beautiful and fertile land as the sun shines upon, are called upon to choose tween Liberty and Despotism—between abject Slavery d the constitutional freedom bequeathed to them by the es of the Revolution. The choice is to be made at once, r every instant of delay rivets their chains. Perhaps it already too late for a successful attempt to overthrow e tyranny at Washington, a tyranny loathsome beyond easure because it binds them captive to the chariot heels of a mercenary race of Yankees whom they despise. t no, it is never too late for a people resolved to be free strike the blow that loosens the shackles imposed by wards in power.

The dispersal of the Convention at Frankfort, the tricks sorted to by the Republicans in Illinois and Indiana, the perial powers vested in Lincoln by the Abolition Con- ess (Parthian arrows of its malignity)—these exhibitions the supreme authority which intends to hold the North- st a "loyal" subject of "the best Government the world er saw," and the slave of the grinding monopolists of New gland, need not deter a people braver, hardier, wiser than eir would-be Yankee masters from asserting inalienable ghts guaranteed them by that Constitution which Lincoln d Seward have so contemptuously trodden under foot, der the specious pleas of "military necessity" and "sav- g the Union;" but in reality to maintain their ill-gotten wer and to create themselves the earls, lords, and barons an enslaved people. It may be difficult for the freemen the Northwest to assert their right in the legitimate ode of popular conventions, and the unrestrained exer- on of the franchise; it may be impossible to secure con- rted action when an Abolition spy is in every household, d a Yankee bayonet at the door of every public building; t where there is a will there is a way, which intelligent en are not slow to find, and courageous men love to fol- w, however beset with danger it may be.

The argument is used here at the South, that Lincoln ll encounter no serious difficulty in enforcing his con- ription in the Northwest, if he will but exercise a little ankee cunning and call out a tenth only of those who ve been enrolled. It will be to the interest of the other ne-tenths to see that the victim who is chosen does his ty and marches promptly to the field of battle, for by so ing they save themselves from conscription. We can- t think so meanly of the men of Illinois and Indiana. ven were they insensible to the sufferings of a fellow-citi- n, perhaps a relative or friend who is hurried to war, aged not for his benefit, but for that of the negro, every an of sense in the disaffected States must know that ar- ies rapidly melt away under the fearful diseases of the uthern swamps, and that they who escape to-day will rely have their turn to-morrow.

But apart from the mean consideration of personal im- unity from the diseases of camp and the dangers of bat- e, there are higher motives to incite the better classes of e Northwest to resist the tyrannical usurpations of the ew England faction, now lording it so bravely in high aces at Washington—the inherent love of liberty; re- ect for the Constitution; a sense of right; a detestation fanaticism, and a thousand other natural and noble im- ulses, which stir the pulse and fire the blood of true man- od when threatened by the base brute force of a govern- ent not his own, and the cupidity of a people hostile to m and to his. Mr. Vallandigham has more than once lled attention to the difference in race between the settlers f Southern Ohio and those who came from Connecticut to habit the rich lands to which they had no shadow of just tle, of the Western Reserve.

The two peoples, though separated by only the imagin- y lines which divide the counties, were as distinct as the nglish and the Hindoo, the French and the Arab. They ad and could have no dealings with each other. There, s in Virginia or South Carolina, the Southern born hated e live Yankee, with his low cunning and sordid parsi- ony. If this be the case in Ohio, it is much more so in uthern Indiana and Illinois, where a still larger propor- on of the population can boast good blood in their veins and sound sense in religion and politics. It is the duty of this population to maintain their rights and to rule, as nature intended them to do, the fanatics and madmen in their midst. They may rest assured that they have no other choice but to rule or be ruled, and the party who would get the upper hand and hold it must lose not a moment. The Abolitionists of the Eastern and Middle States have done well to clothe Lincoln with the imperial purple, for the inborn lawlessness and love of meddling of the Puritan can be curbed only by the iron arm of the one-man power.

Not so with the people of the Northwest; they, or at least a portion of them, are abundantly capable of self-government, and they will be recreant to themselves, to the memories of the past and to the hopes of the future, if by listlessness, by hesitation in asserting their rights, or doubts of their ability to maintain them, they throw away their liberties, and with their own hands sign away the independence of themselves and their children to the remotest generations.

Nor are the Southern-born citizens of the Northwest alone interested in foiling the bold *coup d'etat* by which Lincoln and his Congress have transformed themselves into the masters instead of the servants of the people. Was it to fasten upon their necks a yoke more galling than any of the despotisms of Europe that the foreign-born population of the Northwest left their fatherland and made themselves exiles forever from the homes of their childhood? Was it to find in the land of their adoption a taxation incomparably greater than they ever knew in the land of nativity, that they severed all the ties and associations of early life, braved the perils of the sea, and endured the hardships of existence in a new country and among strange people?

What becomes of their cherished dreams of liberty, equality, and fraternity, now that Lincoln is made Autocrat of America, with the power and determination to keep them a debased and toiling people, while his dukedoms and principalities are lavished upon the Yankees of New England—the "native-born Americans" par excellence? Where are now the fond hopes of acquiring fortunes large enough to return them in honor and in ease to their own country, and to leave to their posterity the inheritance of independence and a high social position? This is no longer possible, now that they are ground to the earth by taxation, and forced to abandon profitable employments for the precarious and poorly-paid condition of a private in the army. Surely, it is a poor consolation to the Germans and Irish of the Northwest to know that in requital for the enslavement of ninety-nine hundredths of their number, Lincoln will graciously bestow titles upon a few of their fortunate fellow-countrymen, such as Rosecrans, Sigel, and Carl Schurz. This most unequal and unjust distribution of favors ought to inspire them with resentment and resistance.

But it is to the soldier in the field that the Northwest must look for deliverance. If he will but say the word, they become a free people in a day. If he submits like a sheep to be led to the shambles, and to be butchered for the sake of the negro—happier, freer, and better fed than himself—then the Northwest is lost. True, the soldier is a slave, and can be made to fight against his will, but not if he is adroit, cautious, and willing to bide his time. A company or a regiment may mutiny and throw down their arms, but they will be compelled to take them up again, or be fired into by Abolition brigades. But if they are smart they will know how and when and where to strike; they will succeed and return rejoicing to their homes. Two years of soldier life in the sterile and thinly-settled South—two years of hard work and poor pay—of digging such as no negro ever did—of endurance of every privation and every disease of the camp and the hospital—ought to have taught the soldier of the Northwest a lesson.

If there must be wars and he must fight, why should he not join the Confederates and turn his eyes to the feast of fat things in the big cities and innumerable towns and villages in the East? There he would find something to repay him for his toil, while in the poverty-stricken and exhausted South, let him fight forever he will find his reward only in the liberation of millions of lazy negroes, who will eat all the little food the Government allows him, and be sent back to his own State to engage in the easy and paying occupations he had been forced to abandon. This is literally everything the soldier of the Northwest has to hope for while fighting against the South. Will he give his heart's blood for such a cause, when by a single word he can command

the peace, enjoy the free navigation of the Mississippi, and find an ever-ready market for his products?

Thus it will be perceived that the Southern-born citizens of the Northwest, the foreign-born as well, and, above all, the soldiers in the field, are quite as much interested in putting down the Yankees and in overthrowing the despotism of Lincoln as the Southerners are. The thoughts to which we have given expression are by no means new; they must have occurred to every reflecting mind north of the Ohio. We do not know that this article will ever reach those for whom it was intended. Lincoln's spies are omnipotent, and his Censor of the Press delights to exclude Rebel newspapers from the West fully as much as to keep the "Copperhead" papers from the camps. But should our suggestions ever reach their destination, we have a sentence to add, viz: When people think alike and have a common interest to maintain, only the basest pusillanimity can excuse such a people for becoming victims of a race so dastardly as the Yankees. The South holds out her hand. Is the Northwest afraid to take it?

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

No. 7.

CHARACTER AND RESULTS OF THE WAR.

How to Prosecute and how to End it.

A THRILLING AND ELOQUENT SPEECH

BY

Major-General B. F. BUTLER.

Reported by A. F. WARBURTON.

Before the return of Gen. Butler from the Department of the Gulf, some of the leading citizens of New York, anxious to testify their admiration of his administration of that Department, and their appreciation of his distinguished services on other fields, united in tendering him a public dinner, addressing him the following letter:

"NEW YORK, Thursday, Jan. 8, 1863.

"*Major-General Benjamin F. Butler, United States Army:*

"Dear Sir,—At a meeting of citizens of this city, held at the Fifth Avenue Hotel on the evening of the 5th instant, for the purpose of expressing the sense of this community in reference to the public services rendered by you to the country, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved,* That the loyal patriotism, indomitable energy, and great administrative ability shown by Major-General Benjamin F. Butler, in the various commands held by him in the service of the country, and especially in his civil and military administration of the duties pertaining to his command of the Department of the Gulf, eminently entitle him to an expression of approbation on the part of the citizens of New York.

"In furtherance of the views thus expressed it was also resolved, that, in addition to such action as may be taken by our municipal authorities, in extending to you the hospitalities of this city, a public dinner be tendered to you by the citizens, and the undersigned were appointed a committee to communicate with you upon the subject.

"We have now the honor to apprise you of the action thus taken, and to ask that you will meet with our citizens at a public dinner at such time, to be appointed by you, as may be consistent with your official duties and your personal convenience.

"In conveying to you this invitation, intended as a tribute of personal respect and esteem, we are well assured that it will not be the less acceptable to you as marked by a still higher significance.

"The citizens of New York, watching the events of the war with a degree of vigilance and anxiety proportioned to the vast interests and influences which converge toward and radiate from this great commercial centre, have recognized

in the course pursued by you in the service and support of the Government, the principles which they deem most essential and indispensable to its triumph. They share with you the conviction that there is no middle or neutral ground between loyalty and treason; that traitors against the Government forfeit all rights of protection and of property; that those who persist in armed rebellion, or aid it less openly but not less effectively, must be put down, and kept down by the strong hand of power and by the use of all rightful means, and that, so far as may be, the sufferings of the poor and the misguided, caused by the rebellion, should be visited upon the authors of their calamities. We have seen with approbation that in applying these principles, amidst the peculiar difficulties and embarrassments incident to your administration in your recent command, you have had the sagacity to devise, the will to execute, and the courage to enforce the measures which they demanded, and we rejoice at the success which has vindicated the wisdom and the justice of your official course. In thus congratulating you upon these results, we believe that we express the feeling of all those who most earnestly desire the speedy restoration of the Union in its full integrity and power; and we trust that you will be able to afford us the opportunity of interchanging with you, in the manner proposed, the patriotic sympathies and hopes which belong to this sacred cause.

"We are, General, with high respect, your friends and obedient servants,

Chas, King,	C. H. Marshall,	L. Bradish,
George Opdyke,	Geo. W. Parsons,	P. Perit,
Horace Webster,	Peter Cooper,	Hamilton Fish,
Robert Bayard,	Isaac Ferris,	John A. King,
Fred. De Peyster,	Chas. H. Russell,	E. D. Morgan,
B. W. Bonney,	Jonathan Sturges,	L. B. Woodruff,
John Paine,	Geo. Griswold,	Murray Hoffman,
W. F. Havemeyer,	I. N. Phelps,	Wm. A. Booth,
John J. Cisco,	Hiram Barney,	David Hoadley,
John J. Phelps,	Denning Duer,	John E. Williams,
D. Dudley Field,	Morris Ketchum,	E. E. Morgan,
Geo. W. Blunt,	R. H. McCurdy,	Wm. Allen Butler,
Ed. Minturn,	Ambrose Snow,	G. S. Robbins,
S. B. Chittenden,	Alex. W. Bradford,	Marsh. O. Roberts,
Elliot C. Cowdin,	Wm. G. Lambert,	J. D. Beers,
Ed. Learned,	Ros. D. Hitchcock,	B. H. Hutton,
Morris Franklin,	Pros. M. Wetmore,	Geo. Folsom,
E. Nye,	Henry H. Ellictt,	J. F. Gray, M. D.,
H. K. Bogert,	M. H. Grinnell,	Russell Sturgess,
H. A. Hurlbut,	Amos R. Eno,	Charles Butler,
Geo. Stevenson,	Jno. A. C. Gray,	G. T. Strong,
Hobart Ford,	Seth B. Hunt,	J. Burns,
Chas. Gould,	R. G. White,	R. A. McCurdy,
Frank E. Howe,	J. A. Pullen,	Isaac Sherman,
Henry W. T. Mall,	Hamlin Blake,	T. T. Buckley,
Paul Spofford,	J. H. Almy,	E. C. Benedict,
N. Sands,	Wm. C. Noyes,	Shepherd Knapp,
E. P. James,	Joseph Rudd,	E. D. James,
S. Draper,	W. Parker, M. D.,	W. H. L. Barnes,
A. Bierstadt,	John Jay,	C. A. Bristed,
L. B. Wyman,	J. Wadsworth,	John B. Hall,
M. B. Field,	Wm. V. Brady,	R. W. Weston,
F. S. Winston,	N. Hayden,	Geo. Dennison,
R. F. Andrews,	Wm. Orton,	C. R. Robert,
Jno. Slosson,	T. G. Churchill,	Joseph Hoxie,
C. H. Ludington,	Wm. C. Bryant,	T. H. Skinner,
Isaac Dayton,	D. Drake Smith,	D. N. Barney,
	Parke Godwin.	

To this, Gen. Butler, at the earliest moment consistent with his official duties, made the following reply:

REPLY OF GENERAL BUTLER.

"LOWELL, Thursday, March 26, 1863.

"Gentlemen,—The necessities of my position have rendered it exceedingly inconvenient for me earlier to reply to your exquisitely courteous and too kind letter of approval of the administration of my command of the Department of the Gulf, asking me to fix a day when I could meet you as therein proposed.

"With every expression of profoundest gratitude for your invitation to partake of a public dinner with the citizens of New York, allow me to suggest that while I am waiting orders to join my brave comrades in the field, it would not be consonant with my sense of duty to accept your flattering hospitalities.

"To you, gentlemen, at home bearing your share of the burdens and expenses of this unholy war, forced upon us by treason, the tendering of such an expression of approbation of the conduct of a public officer was fit and proper, as it was natural and customary, but my acceptance of it would trench upon a different feeling. I too well know the revulsion of feeling with which the soldier in the field, occupying the trenches, pacing the sentinel's weary path in the blazing heat, or watching from his cold bivouac the stars shut out by the drenching cloud, hears of feasting and merry-making at home by those who ought to bear his hardships with him, and the bitterness with which he speaks of those who, thus engaged, are wearing his uniform.

"Upon the scorching sand, and under the brain-trying sun of the Gulf coast, I have too much shared that feeling to add one pang, however slight, to the discomfort which my fellow-soldiers

suffer doing the duties of the camp and field, by my own act, while separated momentarily from them by the exigencies of the public service.

"You will pardon, I am sure, this apparent rudeness of refusal of your most generous proposal, but, under such circumstances, I have spoken too bitterly and too often of the participation by absent officers in such occasions to permit myself to take part in one, even when offered in the patriotic spirit which breathes through your letter, desiring to testify approval of my services to the country.

"It would, however, give me much pleasure to testify my gratitude for your kindness by meeting you and your fellow-citizens in a less formal manner, 'interchanging the patriotic sympathies and hopes which belong to this sacred cause.' Perhaps, by so doing we may do something in aid of that cause. Whatever may strengthen the purpose, deepen the resolution, and fix the determination never to yield this contest until this rebellion, in its roots and branches, in its causes, in its effects and designs, is overthrown and utterly annihilated forever, and the power of the National Government—with its democracying influences and traditional theories of equality of rights, the equality of laws, and equality of privileges for all, as received from the fathers of the Republic—is actively acknowledged upon every inch of the United States territory, is an aid—nay, a necessity—to the cause of the country. To prepare the public mind by doubts, or fears, or suggestions of compromises, or hopes of peace, to be satisfied with any thing less than these demands, is treason to country, humanity, and God—more foul, because more cowardly than rebellion.

"Let, then, every loyal man join hands with his neighbor, sinking all differences of political opinion, which must be minor to this paramount interest, and pledge himself to the fullest support of the Government, with men and means to crush out this treason, and then, and not till then, am I willing to hear anything of political party.

"Again and again returning you my grateful thanks for the courtesy done me by your action, allow me to say that I shall be in New York during the coming week, and shall be happy at any time to meet you, gentlemen, and my fellow-citizens, in such manner as they may think fitting.

"Most respectfully, your obedient servant,

"BENJAMIN F. BUTLER,

"Major-General U. S. V."

In compliance with Gen. Butler's preferences, as expressed in the above, a public reception was arranged, and took place at the Academy of music, Thursday evening, April 2d. The welcome then extended to the gallant soldier, was, in all respects, one of the most enthusiastic and significant ever extended to any honored servant of any people. Long before the hour of commencement, the house was filled in every part, our loyal women alone almost filling the balcony and upper circles. Mrs. Butler and Mrs. Banks were present, sitting in the private boxes, and upon the stage were General Wool, General C. M. Clay, and a large number of our well-known citizens.

Previous to the opening of the meeting Major-General Wool and several officers of his staff entered upon the stage. His appearance was greeted with tremendous cheers.

The applause having subsided, Gen. WOOL advanced to the footlights, and said:

SPEECH OF GEN. WOOL.

I thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for the honor of this recognition. I am not prepared to make a speech on this occasion. You will have those who can speak to you better than I can do. But permit me to say what you already know—I am for putting down this rebellion, *nolens volens*, and will never concede to any compromise until that is accomplished. [Tremendous cheers.]

The orchestra having concluded a beautiful introductory overture, the Union Glee Club came forward and sang, in an excellent manner, "The Sword of Bunker Hill." A loud and long *encore* being given by the audience, the Club sang

"Columbia, we love thee,
Land of the free."

The orchestra soon struck up the enlivening strains of "Hail to the Chief," which gave sure indication that

MAJ.-GEN. BUTLER

was approaching. Soon the General made his appearance, and was received with long and loud continued cheers, the ladies waving their handkerchiefs, while the men strained their throats to give the gallant hero the reception

which was so justly due him. The *coup d'œil* presented on the General's appearance was superb. Parquet, dress circle, and galleries united in most uproarious cheers, and men seemed almost beside themselves with demonstrative zeal. Handkerchiefs and hats were waved, and the uproar continued for several minutes. Silence being restored, Senator MORGAN introduced Maj.-Gen. BUTLER to His Honor Mayor OPDYKE, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR MORGAN.

Mr. MAYOR,—It affords me the greatest pleasure to introduce to you the most efficient officer in the United States service, Maj.-Gen. Benjamin F. Butler. [Loud and continued cheers.]

Gen. BUTLER advanced towards the Mayor, who cordially took his hand and then addressed him as follows:

SPEECH OF THE MAYOR.

GENERAL BUTLER,—The gentlemen upon whose invitation you are here, have charged me with the agreeable duty of bidding you welcome to our city, and expressing to you the warm-hearted greeting, not merely of those present, but of every loyal heart in this loyal metropolis. Our citizens have long desired the privilege of testifying to you personally their great respect for your character, and their high appreciation of your public services. In their name I thank you for having now accorded them this privilege. They have watched your public career during the present war with a constantly increasing interest and admiration. They saw you among the first to abandon an honorable and lucrative profession, and voluntarily take up arms in defence of a government you loved, although it was administered by those whose election you had earnestly opposed. They felt that no stronger evidence could be adduced of an exalted patriotism.

Your first theatre of military service was in Maryland, a State then trembling in the balance between loyalty and treason, and in whose metropolis soldiers of the Union had been assassinated on their way to the protection of the capital. At that critical period you were fortunately placed in command, first at Annapolis and afterward at Baltimore; and it is, perhaps, not too much to say that it was owing to your judicious management, in which you wisely blended moderation with firmness, that Maryland escaped the criminal folly of secession. At all events, you promptly subdued the outbreaks of treason in that State, and thus rendered it safe for our troops to pass through the city of Baltimore without molestation.

You were next placed in command at Fortress Monroe, where you made the sagacious discovery that slaves were contraband of war. In view of the tenderness with which our Government and its military commanders had up to that time treated the institution of slavery, this discovery must be regarded as one of the most valuable of the war, and therefore one which entitles you to the public gratitude. It quietly but most effectively divested the "divine institution" of all its sanctity in the presence of war.

From Fortress Monroe you were transferred to a wider field of usefulness, by being placed in command of the Department of the Gulf. Your friends knew that in a position so environed with difficulties as this, no ordinary commander could hope to acquit himself with credit. You soon found yourself, with a handful of men, remote from your base of supplies and from succor, in the metropolis of the Confederacy, where the population, with few exceptions, was intensely hostile to the National Government; and the moment they discovered the fidelity and ability with which you upheld the interests of the Government, all their intensity of hatred was transferred to you personally. They grossly misrepresented your acts; the wilfully misinterpreted your language; they heaped on you the vilest epithets, and in every conceivable way labored to cover your name with infamy.

The rebel government and the rebel press throughout the Confederacy took up the theme and repeated these slanders, with every variation that ingenuity could suggest. The rebel chief, in his annual message, even went so far as to brand you as an outlaw, and to decree your execution in case you should fall into the hands of his military forces. They also conferred on you, I believe, the exclusive honor of offering a large reward for your head. Nor were the malignant slanders I have referred to uttered only by the rebels. Their sympathizers at the North and throughout Europe joined in the refrain, and re-echoed their bitter denunciations.

Abuse from the bad, like praise from the good, affords presumptive evidence of merit. Hence, if our Government or its true friends had been ignorant of your policy, they might

have safely inferred, from this clamor of its bitter enemies, that that policy was just and wise. But, sir, the loyal people of the North were not ignorant of your acts or your policy. They saw that your capacious and fertile mind, your resolute will, your dauntless courage, and your earnest patriotism, rendered you master of the situation, and fitted you, above all other men, for the difficult position in which you were placed. They saw that you fully comprehended your duty as a military commander, as a legislator, as a judge, as an executive officer, and as a tamer of rebel madmen and mad women—for your sphere of duty embraced all these; and they saw that your firm will stood ever ready to execute what your judgment dictated and your conscience approved.

In thus acting, you strengthened the cause of your Government, which is the cause of justice and right. But you at the same time weakened the cause of its enemies, which is the cause of oppression and wrong. For this they hate and revile you; for that we esteem and praise you.

But, sir, you shocked the sensibilities of Secessia and all its partisans in the outer world by that terrible decree, called Order No. 28. That order, as I understand it, was simply intended to extend a salutary police arrangement, which had long existed in New Orleans, so as to bring within its jurisdiction and restraint the improper conduct of those aristocratic dames who gloried in heaping insults on the soldiers of the Union. It had the desired effect. It improved their manners and their modesty; for which, sir, I doubt not, they will in due time return you thanks instead of execrations, as now. The presence of our wives and daughters here to-night proves that the ladies of New York regard that far-famed order, both in its intention and effects, as proper and salutary.

You gave lessons equally useful to the sterner sex. You taught them to respect the authority of the United States, and to fear its power. You treated as enemies of your country all who avowed themselves as such, and, in strict accordance with the usages of war and the laws of the United States, you confiscated their property and appropriated it to the support of their own poor, and in providing for the wants of your army.

By these and kindred measures you purified the moral, social, and political atmosphere of a city in which each had been rendered most noxious by the unbridled reign of treason and the vices engendered by slavery. By your wise sanitary regulations you also kept the material atmosphere pure, and thus excluded pestilence. As a former resident of New Orleans, I know that to have accomplished this in a city so unhealthy, and where all previous efforts in that direction had failed, must be regarded as one of your noblest achievements. I have little doubt that among its beneficial results was the preservation of the lives of at least one-half of your command. Your troops were all unacclimated. The yellow fever prevailed at nearly all the neighboring ports on the Gulf and in the West Indies, and, but for your vigorous quarantine and strict sanitary regulations within the city, would have become epidemic in New Orleans. In that event, your whole army would have been attacked by it—for none of the unacclimated escape—and it is known that at least fifty per cent of the cases prove fatal.

By means like these you husbanded your small command and slender means in such a masterly manner that during eight months service you did not call upon the Government for a dollar, except for the pay of your soldiers; and you turned over to your successor two thousand more troops than you had received from your Government, with military lines embracing two-thirds of the population, and nearly that proportion of the territory of the State of Louisiana.

The brief sketch I have thus given of your achievements in the Department of the Gulf might be indefinitely extended. But I have said enough to show that you have made a record of which any commander, however distinguished, might justly feel proud, and which the present and future generations will not fail to appreciate.

We, sir, glory in the fact that our country and our institutions can, in an emergency, produce from private life ready-made military commanders, statesmen and jurists of the highest type, and all combined in a single individual. In your late command you have been called upon to exercise the functions appertaining to each of these, and it must be conceded that you acquitted yourself admirably in all. As a commander, you did not prosecute war in the spirit of peace, but with the iron-handed rigor which its necessities demand and its usages justify, and which is an indispensable element of success. As a jurist and lawyer, you proved yourself a perfect master of every

code that could be applied to the novel legal questions presented for your decision. In truth, your legal acumen was quite an overmatch for that of the leading rebels and their sympathetic consular allies. But, sir, it is for the statesmanlike qualities evinced by you in this contest that your friends are disposed to award you the highest praise. You seem to them to comprehend most perfectly all the principles involved in the present contest, as well as the best means of bringing it to a successful issue. Your pioneer mind, like Daniel Boone, among the border men of the West, seems to keep in advance of all others. You are familiar with the causes that produced the war; you have shared in its progress, and have had leisure since your return from active service to take a dispassionate survey of its present status and its probable future. We shall feel greatly obliged if you will give us your views on such of these topics as may be agreeable to you, feeling well assured that whatever you may say will be marked by your accustomed originality of thought and breadth of knowledge, and must therefore prove both interesting and instructive.

Without detaining you longer, General, permit me to renew my assurance of welcome, and then present you to an assemblage worthy of such a guest.

The MAYOR, at the conclusion of the address, again took the General cordially by the hand, and presented him to the assembly as one of the best specimens of the volunteer army of the United States. [Prolonged cheers.]

General BUTLER acknowledged the courteous reception, and spoke as follows:

SPEECH OF GEN. BUTLER.

Mr. MAYOR,—With the profoundest gratitude for the too flattering commendation of my administration of the various trusts committed to me by the Government, which, in behalf of your associates, you have been pleased to tender, I ask you to receive my most heartfelt thanks. To the citizens of New York here assembled, graced by the fairest and loveliest, in kind appreciation of my services supposed to have been rendered to the country, I tender the deepest acknowledgments. [Applause.] I accept it all, not for myself, but for my brave comrades of the Army of the Gulf. [Renewed applause.] I receive it as an earnest of your devotion to the country—an evidence of your loyalty to the Constitution under which you live, and under which you hope to die. In order that the acts of the Army of the Gulf may be understood, perhaps it would be well, at a little length, with your permission, that some detail should be given of the thesis upon which we fulfilled our duties. The first question, then, to be ascertained is, what is this contest in which the country is engaged? At the risk of being a little tedious, at the risk even of calling your attention to what might seem otherwise too elementary, I propose to run down through the history of the contest to see what it is that agitates the whole country at this day and this hour. That we are in the midst of civil commotion, all know. But what is that commotion? Is it a riot? Is it an insurrection? Is it a rebellion? Or is it a revolution? And pray, sir, although it may seem still more elementary, what is a riot? A riot, if I understand it, is simply an outburst of the passions of a number of men for the moment, in breach of the law, by force of numbers, to be put down and subdued by the civil authorities; if it goes further, to be dealt with by the military authorities. But you say, sir, "Why treat us to a definition of a riot upon this occasion? Why, of all things, should you undertake to instruct a New York audience in what a riot is?" [Laughter.] To that I answer, because the Administration of Mr. Buchanan dealt with this great change of affairs as if it were a riot; because his Government officer gave the opinion that in Charleston it was but a riot; and that, as there was no civil authority there, to call out the military, therefore, Sumter must be given over to the rioters; and that was the beginning of this struggle. Let us see how it grew up. I deal not now in causes but with effects—facts. Directly after the guns of the rebels had turned upon Sumter, the several States of the South, in Convention assembled, inaugurated a series of movements which took out from the Union divers States; and as each was attempted to be taken out, the riots, if such existed, were no longer found in them, but they become insurrectionary; and the Administration, upon the 15th of April, 1861, dealt with this state of affairs as an insurrection, and called out the militia of the United States to subdue an insurrection. I was called at that time into the service to administer the laws in putting down an insurrection. I found a riot at Baltimore. They had burned bridges; but the riot had hardly arisen to the dignity of an insurrection, because the

State had not moved as an organized community. A few men were rioting at Baltimore; and as I marched there at the head of United States troops, the question came up, What have I before me? You will remember that I offered then to put down all kinds of insurrections so long as the State of Maryland remained loyal to the United States. Transferred from thence to a wider sphere at Fortress Monroe, I found that the State of Virginia, through its organization, had taken itself out of the Union, and was endeavoring to erect for itself an independent government; and I dealt with that State as being in rebellion, and thought the property of the rebels, of whatever name or nature, should be dealt with as rebellious property, and contraband of war, subject to the laws of war. [Great applause.] I have been thus careful in stating these various steps, because, although through your kindness replying to eulogy, I am here answering every charge of inconsistency and wrong of intention for my acts done before the country. Wrong in judgment I may have been; but, I insist, wrong in intention or inconsistent to my former opinions, never Upon the same theory by which I felt myself bound to put down insurrection in Maryland, while it remained loyal, whether that insurrection was the work of blacks or whites, by the same loyalty to the Constitution and laws, I felt bound to confiscate slave property in the rebellious State of Virginia. [Applause.] Pardon me, sir, if right here I say that I am a little sensitive upon this topic. I am an old-fashioned Andrew Jackson Democrat of twenty years' standing. [Applause. A voice: "The second hero of New Orleans." Renewed applause culminating in three cheers.] And so far as I know, I have never swerved, so help me God, from one of his teachings. [Great applause.] Up to the time that disunion took place, I went as far as the farthest in sustaining the constitutional rights of the States. However bitter or distasteful to me were the obligations my fathers had made for me in the compromise of the Constitution, it was not for me to pick out the sweet from the bitter; and, fellow-democrats, I took them all [loud cheers] because they were constitutional obligations [applause]; and sustaining them all, I stood by the South and by Southern rights under the Constitution until I advanced and looked into the very pit of disunion, and into which they plunged, and then not liking the prospect I quietly withdrew. [Immense applause and laughter.] And from that hour we went apart, how far apart you can judge when I tell you, that on the 28th December, 1860, I shook hands on terms of personal friendship with Jefferson Davis, and on the 28th of December, 1862, I had the pleasure of reading his proclamation that I was to be hanged at sight. [Great applause and laughter.] And now, my friends, if you will allow me to pause for a moment in this line of thought, as we come up to the point of time, when these men laid down their constitutional obligations, let me ask, what then were my rights, and what were theirs? At that hour they repudiated the Constitution of the United States, by vote in solemn Convention; and not only that, but they took arms in their hands, and undertook by force to rend from the Government what seemed to them the fairest portion of the heritage which my fathers had given to you and me as a rich legacy for our children. When they did that, they abrogated, abnegated, and forfeited every constitutional right, and released me from every constitutional obligation, so far as they were concerned. [Loud cheers.] Therefore when I was thus called upon to say what should be my action thereafter with regard to slavery, I was left to the natural instincts of my heart, as prompted by a Christian education in New England, and I dealt with it accordingly. [Immense applause.] The same sense of duty to my constitutional obligations, and to the rights of the several States that required me, so long as those States remained under the Constitution, to protect the system of slavery,—that same sense of duty after they had gone out from under the Constitution, caused me to follow the dictates of my own untrammelled conscience. So you see—and I speak now to my old Democratic friends—that, however misjudging I may have been, we went along together, step by step, up to that point; and I claim that we ought still to go on in the same manner. We acknowledged the right of those men to hold slaves, because it was guaranteed to them by the compromise of our fathers in the Constitution; but if their State rights were to be respected, because of our allegiance to the Constitution and our respect to State rights, when that sacred obligation was taken away by their own traitorous acts, and we, as well as the negroes, were disenthralled, why should not we follow the dictates of God's law and humanity? [Tremendous applause, and cries of "Bravo, Bravo."] By the exigencies of

the public service removed once more to another sphere of action, at New Orleans, I found this problem coming up in another form, and that led me to examine and see how far had progressed this civil commotion, now carried on by force of arms. I found under our complex system of States, each having an independent government, with the United States covering all, that there can be treason to a State and not to the United States, revolution in a State and not as regards the United States, loyalty to a State and disloyalty to the Union, and loyalty to the Union and disloyalty to the organized Government of a State. As an illustration, take the troubles which almost lately arose in the State of Rhode Island, where there was an attempt to rebel against the State Government and to change the form of that Government, but no rebellion against the United States. All of you are familiar with the movements of Mr. Dorr; in that matter there was no intent of disloyalty against the United States, but a great deal against the State Government. I therefore in Louisiana found a State Government that had entirely changed its form, and had revolutionized itself so far as it could; had created courts and imposed taxes; and put in motion all kinds of governmental machinery; and I found so far as this State Government was concerned, Louisiana was no longer in and of itself one of the United States of America. It had, so far as it could, changed its State Government, and by solemn act had forever seceded from the United States of America and attempted to join the Confederate States. I found, I respectfully submit, a revolutionized State! There had been a revolution, by force; beyond a riot, which is an infraction of the law; beyond an insurrection, which is an abnegation of the law; beyond a rebellion, which is an attempt to override the law by force of numbers; and, further, I found a new State Government formed, that was being supported by force of arms. Now, I asked myself, upon what thesis shall I deal with those people? Organized into a community under forms of law, they had seized a portion of the territory of the United States; and I respectfully submit I had to deal with them as alien enemies. [Great applause.] They had forever passed the boundary of "wayward sisters," or "erring brothers," unless indeed they erred toward us as Cain did against his brother Abel. They had passed beyond that and outside of it. Aye, and Louisiana had done this in the strongest possible way, for she had seized on territory which the Government of the United States had bought and paid for. Therefore I dealt with them as alien enemies. [Applause.] And what rights have alien enemies, captured in war? They have the right, so long as they behave themselves and are non-combatants, to be free from personal violence; they have no other rights; and therefore, it was my duty to see to it, (and I believe the record will show, I did see to it,) [great applause and loud cheers,] that order was preserved, and that every man who behaved well, and did not aid the Confederate States, should not be molested in his person. I held, by the laws of war, that everything else they had was at the mercy of the conqueror. [Cheers.] Permit me to state the method in which their rights were defined by one gentleman of my staff. He very coolly paraphrased the Dred Scott decision, and said they had no rights which a negro was bound to respect. [Loud and prolonged laughter and cheers.] But, dealing with them in this way, I took care to protect all men in personal safety. Now I hear a friend behind me say: "But how does your theory affect loyal men?" The difficulty in answering that proposition, is this: in governmental action the Government, in making peace and carrying on war, cannot deal with individuals, but with organized communities, whether organized wrongly or rightly [cheers]; and all I could do, so far as my judgment taught me, for the loyal citizen, was to see to it that no exaction should be made of him, and no property taken away from him, that was not absolutely necessary for the success of military operations. I know nothing else that I could do. I could not alter the carrying on of the war, because loyal citizens were, unfortunately, like Dog Tray, found in bad company [laughter], and to their persons, and to their property, even, all possible protection I caused to be afforded. But let me repeat—for it is quite necessary to keep this in mind, and I am afraid that for want of so doing, some of my old Democratic friends have got lost, in going from one portion of the country to the other, in their thoughts and feelings—let me repeat that, in making war or making peace, carrying on governmental operations of any sort, governments and their representatives, so far as I am instructed, can deal only with organized communities, and men must

fall or rise with the communities in which they are situated. You in New York must follow the Government as expressed by the will of the majority of your State, until you can revolutionize that Government and change it; and those loyal at the South must, until this contest comes into process of settlement, also follow the action of the organized majorities in which their lot has been cast, and no man, no set of men, can see the possible solution of this or any other governmental problem, as affecting States, except upon this basis. Now, then, to pass from the particular to the general, to leave the detail in Louisiana, of which I have run down the account, rather as illustrating my meaning than otherwise, I come back to the question: What is the contest with all the States that are banded together in the so-called Confederate States? Into what form has it come? It started in insurrection; it grew up a rebellion; it has become a revolution, and carries with it all the rights of a revolution. Our Government has dealt with it upon that ground. When the Government blockaded Southern ports, they dealt with it as a revolution; when they sent out cartels of exchange of prisoners, they dealt with these people no longer as simple insurrectionists and traitors, but as organized revolutionists, who had set up a government for themselves upon the territory of the United States. Sir, let no man say to me, "Why, then you acknowledge the rights of revolution in these men!" I beg your pardon, sir, I only acknowledge the *fact* of revolution—that which has actually happened I look these things in the face, and I do not dodge them because they are unpleasant; I find this a revolution, and these men are no longer, I repeat, our erring brethren, but they are our alien enemies, foreigners [cheers] carrying on war against us, attempting to make alliances against us, attempting surreptitiously to get into the family of nations. I agree that it is not a successful revolution, and a revolution never to be successful [loud cheers],—pardon me, I was speaking theoretically, as a matter of law,—never to be successful until acknowledged by the parent State. Now, then, I am willing to unite with you in your cheers, when you say, a revolution, the rightfulness or success of which we never will acknowledge. [Cheers.] Why, sir, have I been so careful in bringing down with great particularity these distinctions? Because, in my judgment, there are certain logical consequences following from them as necessarily as various corollaries from a problem in Euclid. If we are at war, as I think, with a foreign country, to all intents and purposes, how can a man here stand up and say he is on the side of that foreign country and not be an enemy to his country? [Cheers.] A man must be either for his country or against his country. [Cheers.] He cannot, upon this theory, be throwing impediments all the time in the way of the progress of his Government, under pretense that he is helping some other portion of his country. If any loyal man thinks that he must do something to bring back his erring brethren, if he likes that form of phrase, at the South, let him take his musket and go down and try it in that way. [Cheers.] If he is still of a different opinion, and thinks that is not the best way to bring them back, but he can do it by persuasion and talk, let him go down with me to Louisiana, and I will set him over to Mississippi, and if the rebels do not feel for his heart-strings, but not in love, I will bring him back. [Cheers, loud and prolonged. "Send Wood down first!"] Let us say to him: Choose ye this day whom ye will serve. If the Lord thy God be God, serve him; if Baal be God, serve ye him. [Cheers.] But no man can serve two masters, God and Mammon. ["That's so."] Again, there are other logical consequences to flow from the view which I have ventured to take of this subject, and that is with regard to our relations from past political action. If they are now alien enemies, I am bound to them by no ties of party fealty. They have passed out of that, and I think we ought to go back only to examine and see if all ties of party allegiance and party fealty as regards them are not broken, and satisfy ourselves that it is your duty and mine to look simply to our country and to its service, and leave them to look to the country they are attempting to erect, and to its service; and then let us try the conclusion with them. Mark, by this I give up no territory of the United States. Every foot that was ever circumscribed on the map by the lines around the United States belongs to us. [Applause.] None the less because bad men have attempted to organize worse government upon various portions of it. It is to be drawn in under our laws and our Government as soon as the power of the United States can be exerted for that purpose, and, therefore, my friends, you see the next set of logical conse-

quences that prove our theory; that we have no occasion to carry on the fight for the Constitution as it was. I beg your pardon, the Constitution as it is. Who is interfering with the Constitution as it is? Who makes any attacks upon the Constitution? We are fighting with those who have gone out and repudiated the Constitution, and made another Constitution for themselves. [Cheers.] And, now, my friends, I do not know but I shall use some heresy, but as a Democrat, as an Andrew Jackson Democrat, I am not for the Union as it was. [Great cheering. "Good!" "Good!"] I say, as a Democrat, and an Andrew Jackson Democrat, I am not for the Union to be again as it was. Understand me; I was for Union, because I saw, or thought I saw, the troubles in the future which have burst upon us; but having undergone those troubles, having spent all this blood and this treasure, I do not mean to go back again and be cheek by jowl with South Carolina as I was before, if I can help it. [Cheers. "You're right."] Mark me, now, let no man misunderstand me, and I repeat, lest I may be misunderstood—there are none so slow to understand as those who do not want to—mark me, I say I do not mean to give up a single inch of the soil of South Carolina. If I had been alive at that time, and had had the position, the will, and the ability, I would have dealt with South Carolina as Jackson did, and kept her in the Union at all hazards, but now she has gone out, and I will take care that when she comes in again, she comes in better behaved [cheers], that she shall no longer be the firebrand of the Union—aye, and that she shall enjoy what her people never yet have enjoyed—the blessings of a Republican form of Government. [Applause.] Therefore, in that view, I am not for the reconstruction of the Union as it was. I have spent treasure and blood enough upon it, in conjunction with my fellow-citizens, to make it a little better. [Cheers.] I think we can have a better Union the next time. It was good enough if it had been left alone. The old house was good enough for me, but as they have pulled down all the L part, I propose, when we build it up, to build it up with all the modern improvements. [Prolonged laughter and applause.] Another of the logical sequences, it seems to me, that follow with inexorable and not-to-be-shunned sequence upon this proposition, that we are dealing with alien enemies, is with regard to our duties as to the confiscation of their property, and that question would seem to me to be easy of settlement under the Constitution, and without any discussion, if my first proposition is right. Has it not been held from the beginning of the world down to this day, from the time the Israelites took possession of the Land of Canaan, which they got from alien enemies—has it not been held that the whole property of those alien enemies belonged to the conqueror, and that it has been at his mercy and his clemency what should be done with it? For one, I would take it and give the loyal man who was loyal in the heart of the South, enough to make him as well as he was before, and I would take the balance of it and distribute it among the volunteer soldiers who have gone——[the remainder of the sentence was drowned in a tremendous burst of applause.] And so far as I know them, if we should settle South Carolina with them, in the course of a few years I would be quite willing to receive her back into the Union. [Renewed applause.] That leads us to deal with another proposition: What shall be done with the slaves? Here again the laws of war have long settled, with clearness and exactness, that it is for the conqueror, for the government which has maintained or extended its jurisdiction over the conquered territory, to deal with slaves as it pleases, to free them or not as it chooses. It is not for the conquered to make terms, or to send their friends into the conquered country to make terms for them. [Applause] Another corollary follows from the proposition that we are fighting with alien enemies, which relieves us from another difficulty which seems to trouble some of my old Democratic friends, and that is in relation to the question of arming the negro slaves. If the seceded States are alien enemies, is there any objection that you know of, and if so, state it, to our arming one portion of the foreign country against the other while they are fighting us? [Applause, and cries of "No!" "No!"] Suppose that we were at war with England. Who would get up here in New York and say that we must not arm the Irish, lest they should hurt some of the English? [Applause.] And yet at one time, not very far gone, all those Englishmen were our grandfathers' brothers. Either they or we erred; but we are now separate nations. There can be no objection, for another reason, because there is no law of war or of nations,—no rule of governmental action that I

know of,—which prevents a country from arming any portion of its citizens; and if the slaves do not take part in the rebellion, they become simply our citizens residing in our territory which is at present usurped by our enemies. [Applause.] At this waning hour, I do not propose to discuss, but merely to hint at these various subjects. [Cries of "Go on."] There is one question I am frequently asked, and most frequently by my old Democratic friends:—"Why, Gen. Butler, what is your experience? Will the negroes fight?" To that I answer, I have no personal experience, because I left the Department of the Gulf before they were fairly brought into action. But they did fight under Jackson, at Chalmette. More than that. Let Napoleon III. answer, who has hired them to do what the veterans of the Crimea cannot do—to whip the Mexicans. Let the veterans of Napoleon I., under Le Clerc, who were whipped by them out of San Domingo, say whether they will fight or not. What has been the demoralizing effect upon them as a race by their contact with white men, I know not; but I cannot forget that their fathers would not have been slaves, but that they were captives in war, in their own country, in hand to hand fights among the several chiefs. They would fight at some time; and if you want to know any more than that, I can only advise you to try them. [Great applause.] Passing to another logical deduction from the principle that we are carrying on war against alien enemies, (for I pray you to remember that I am only carrying out the same idea upon which the Government acted when it instituted the blockade,) I meet the question whether we thereby give foreign nations any greater rights than if we considered them as a rebellious portion of our country. We have heretofore seemed to consider, that if we acknowledged that there was a revolution, and there were alien enemies in this fight, that therefore we should give to foreign nations greater right to interfere in our affairs than they would have if they were rebels, considered and held by us as rebels, only in the rebellious part of our own country. The first answer to that is this: that, so far as the rebels are concerned, they are estopped to deny that they are exactly what they claim themselves to be, alien enemies; and, so far as foreign nations are concerned, while they are alien to us, yet they are upon our territory, and until we acknowledge them, there is no better settled rule of the law of nations, than that the recognition of them is an act of war. They have no more right to recognize them, because we say, "We will deal with you as belligerent aliens enemies," than they would have to deal with them if we dealt with them simply as rebels; and no country is more sternly and strongly bound by that view than is England, because she held the recognition by France of our independence to be an act of war and declared war accordingly. [Applause.] Therefore, I do not see who would lose any rights. We do not allow that this is a rightful rebellion—we do not recognize it as such—we do not act toward it except in the best way we can to put it down and to re-revolutionize the country. But what is the duty, then, of neutrals, if these are alien enemies? We find them a people with whom no neutral nation has any treaty of amity or alliance; they are strangers to every neutral nation, and, for example, let us take the English. The English nation have no treaty with the rebels—have no relations with the rebels—open relations I mean, [laughter,] none that are recognized by the laws of nations. They have a treaty of amity and friendship with us, and now what is their duty in the contest between us and our enemies, to whom they are strangers? They claim it to be neutrality, such neutrality as they would maintain between two friendly nations with whom they have had treaties of amity. Let me illustrate: I have two friends that have got into a quarrel—into a fight, if you please; I am on equally good terms with both, and I do not choose to take a part with either. I treat them as belligerents, and hold myself neutral. That is the position of a nation, where two equally friendly nations are fighting. But I have a friend again who is fighting with a stranger, with whom I have nothing to do, of whom I know nothing that is good, of whom I have seen nothing except that he would fight—what is my duty, my friends, in that case? To stand perfectly neutral? It is not the part of a friend, as between men, and it is not the part of a friendly nation as between nations. And yet, from some strange misconception, our English friends profess to do no more than to stand perfectly neutral, while they have treaties of amity with us and no treaty which they acknowledge with the South. [Applause.] And, therefore, I say it is a much higher duty on the part of foreign nations toward us when we are in contest with a nation with which

they have no treaty of amity. To illustrate how this fact bears upon this question: the English say, "Oh! we are going to be neutral; we will not sell you any arms, because we should have to sell the same to the Confederates." To that I answer: You have got treaties of amity and commerce with us by which you agree to trade with us. You have got no treaty of amity or commerce with them by which you agree to trade with them. Why not, then, trade with us? why not give us that right of preference, except for reasons that I will state hereafter? I have been thus particular upon this, because in stating these views to gentlemen in whose judgment I have great confidence, they have said to me, "I agree to your views, Mr. Butler, but I am afraid you will involve us with other nations, in the view that you take of that matter." But I insist, and I can only state the proposition—your own minds will carry it out familiarly—I insist that there is a higher and closer duty to us—treating the rebels as a strange nation, not yet admitted into the family of nations—that there is a higher duty from our old friendship, from our old relations toward Great Britain, than there is to this pushing, attempting-to-get-into-place member of the family of nations.

There is still another logical sequence which, in my judgment, follows from this view of the case. The great question put to me, my friends, and the great question which is now agitating this country, is, How are we to get these men back? how are we to get this territory back? how are we to reconstruct the nation? I think it is much better answered upon this hypothesis than any other: There are but two ways in which this contest can be ended; one is by re-revolutionizing a portion of this territory, and have them come to ask to be admitted into the Union; another is, to bring it all back, so that if they do not come back in the first way, they shall come back bound to our triumphal car of victory. [Applause.] Now, when any portion of the South becomes loyal to the North and to the Union, or, to express it with more care, when any portion of the inhabitants of the South wish to become again a part of the nation, and will throw off the government of Jefferson Davis, erect themselves into a State, and come and ask us to take them back with such a State Constitution as they ought to be admitted back again under, there is no difficulty in its being done. There is no witchery about this. This precise thing has been done in the case of Western Virginia. She went out—stayed out for a while. By the aid of our armies, and by the efforts of her citizens, she re-revolutionized, she threw off the government of the rest of the State of Virginia; she threw off the Confederate yoke; she erected herself into a State, with a Constitution such as I believe is quite satisfactory to all of us, especially the amendment. [Applause.] She has asked to come back, and has been received back, and is the first entering wedge of that series of States which will come back that way. But suppose they will not come back? We are bound to subjugate them. What, then, do they become? Territories of the United States—[great applause]—acquired by force of arms—[renewed applause]—precisely as we acquired California, precisely as we acquired Nevada, precisely as we acquired--not exactly, though—as we acquired Texas—[laughter]; and then is there any difficulty in dealing with these men? Was there any difficulty in dealing with the State of California, when our men went there and settled in sufficient numbers so as to give that State the benefits of the blessings of a republican form of government? Was there any difficulty in obtaining her, beyond our transactions with Mexico? None whatever. Will there be any difficulty in taking to us the new State of Nevada when she is ready to come and ripe to come? Was there any difficulty in taking any portion of the Louisiana purchase, when we bought her first? Will there be any difficulty, when her people get ready to come back to the United States, of our taking her back again, more than, perhaps, to carry out the parallel a little further, to pay a large sum of money besides, as we did in the case of California after we conquered it from Mexico? These States having gone out without cause, without right, without grievance, and having formed themselves into new States, and taken upon themselves new alliances, I am not for having them come back without readmission. I feel, perhaps, if the ladies will pardon the illustration, like a husband whose wife has run away with another man, and has divorced herself from him; he cannot take her to his arms until they have come before the priest and been remarried. [Laughter.] I have, I say, the same feeling in the case of these people that have gone out; when they repent, and ask to come back, I am ready to receive them; and I am

not ready until then. And now, having gone by far too discursively over many of these points which I desired to bring to your attention, let us return to what has been done, in the Department of the Gulf, to which you have so flatteringly alluded, and to which I will answer. While I am very much gratified at the kind expression of your regard, whether that expression is justified can be told in a single word. When I left the Department of the Gulf, I sat down and deliberately put in the form of an address, to the people of that Department, the exact acts I had done while in their Department; and I said to them, "I have done these things," and I have now waited more than three months, and I have yet to hear a denial from that Department that these things were done. [Applause.] And to that, sir, I can point alone as a justification of your too flattering eulogy, and to that I point forever as an answer to every slander and every calumny. The ladies of New Orleans knew whether they were safe; has any one of them ever said she was not? The men of New Orleans knew whether life and property were safe; has any man ever said they were not? The poor of New Orleans knew whether the money which was taken from the rich rebels, was applied to the alleviation of their wants; has any man denied that it was? To that record I point—and it will be the only answer that I shall ever make; and I only do it now because I desire that you shall have neither doubt nor feeling upon this subject—it is the only answer I can ever make to the thousand calumnies that have been poured upon me and mine, and upon the officers who worked with me for the good of our country. [Applause.] I desire now to say a single word upon the question, what are the prospects of this war? My simple opinion would be no better than that of another man; but let me show you the reason for the faith that is in me that this war is progressing steadily to a successful termination. Compare the state of the country on January 1, 1863, with the state of the country on January 1, 1862, and tell me whether there has not been progress. At that time the Union armies held no considerable portion of Missouri, of Kentucky, or of Tennessee; none of Virginia except Fortress Monroe and Arlington Heights; none of North Carolina save Hatterass, and none of South Carolina save Port Royal. All the rest was ground of struggle at least, and all the rest furnishing supplies to the rebels. Now they hold none of Missouri, none of Kentucky, none of Tennessee, for any valuable purpose of supplies, because the western portion is in our hands, and the eastern portion has been so run over by the contending armies that the supplies are gone. They hold no portion of Virginia valuable for supplies, for that is eaten out by their armies. We hold one-third of Virginia, and half of North Carolina. We hold our own in South Carolina; and I hope that, before the 11th of this month, we shall hold a little more. [Applause.] We hold two-thirds of Louisiana, in wealth and population. We hold all Arkansas and all Texas, so far as supplies are concerned, so long as Farragut is between Port Hudson and Vicksburg. [Applause.] And I believe the colored troops held Florida, at the last accounts. Now, then, let us see to what the rebellion is reduced. It is reduced to the remainder of Virginia, part of North Caorlina, all of Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi, and a small portion of Louisiana and Tennessee; Texas and Arkansas, as I said before, being cut off. Why I draw strong hopes from this is, that their supplies all come either from Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Arkansas, or Texas, and these are completely now beyond their reach. To that I look largely for the suppression of this rebellion, and the overthrow of this revolution. They have got to the end of their conscription; we have not begun ours. They have got to the end of their national credit; we have not put ours in any market in the world. [Applause.] And why should any man be desponding? why should any man say that this great work has gone on too slowly? why should men feel impatient? The war of the Revolution was seven years. Why should men be so anxious that nations should march faster than they are prepared to march—faster than the tread of nations has ever been in the Providence of God? Nations in war have ever moved slowly. We are too impatient—we never learn anything, it would seem to me, from reading history—I speak of myself as well as you—I have shared in that impatience myself. I have shared in the various matters of disappointment. I was saying but the other day, to a friend of mine, "It seems strange to me that our navy cannot catch that steamer *Alabama;* there must be something wrong in the Navy Department, I am afraid," and I got quite impatient. I had hardly got over the wound inflicted by the capture of the *Jacob Bell,* when came the *Golden Eagle,* and the *Lady Jane,* and as one was from

Boston, it touched me keenly. [Applause.] He replied: "Don't be impatient, remember that Paul Jones, with a sailing ship on the coast of England, put the whole British navy at defiance for many months, and wandered up and down that coast, and worked his will upon it, [applause,] and England had no naval power to contend with, and had not 2,500 miles to blockade. I remember that in the French war, Lord Cochrane, with one vessel, and that was by no means a steamship, held the whole French coast against the French navy. And so it has been done by other nations. Let us have a little patience, and possess our souls with a little patriotism, and less politics, and we shall have no difficulty. [Applause, and "Good."] But there is one circumstance of this war, I am bound to say in all frankness to you, that I do not like the appearance of, and that is, because we cannot exactly reach it I refer to the war made upon our commerce, which is not the fault of the navy, nor of any department of the Government, but is the fault of our allies. [Applause.] Pardon me a moment, for I am speaking now in the commercial city of New York, where I think it is of interest to you, and of a matter to which I have given some reflection —pardon me a moment, until we examine and see what England has done. She agreed to be neutral—I tried to demonstrate to you that she ought to have been a little more—but has she been even that? ["No, no, no."] Let us see the evidences of that "no." In the first place, there has been nothing of the Union cause that her orators and her statesmen have not maligned—there has been nothing of sympathy or encouragement which she has not afforded our enemies—there has been nothing which she could do under the cover of neutrality which she has not done to aid them. ["That is true."] Nassau has been a naval arsenal for pirate rebel boats to refit in. Kingston has been the coal depot, and Barbadoes has been the dancing hall to *fete* pirate chieftains in. [Applause.] What cause, my friends—what cause, my countrymen, has England so to deal with us? What is the reason she does so deal with us? Is it because we have never shown sympathy toward her or love to her people? And mark me here, that I make a distinction between the English people as a mass and the English Government. [Applause.] I think the heart of her people beats responsive to ours—[applause]—but I know her Government and aristocracy hate us with a hate which passeth all understanding. [Applause.] I say, let us see if we have given any cause for this. I know, I think, what the cause is; but let us see what we have done. You remember that when the famine overtook the Irish in 1847, the *Macedonian* frigate carried out the bread from this country to feed the poor that England was starving. [Applause.] When afterward the heir to her throne arrived here, aye, in this very house, our people assembled to do him welcome in such numbers that the very floor would not uphold them [laughter], and to testify our appreciation of the high qualities of his mother and sovereign, and our love of the English people—we gave him such a reception as Northern gentlemen give to their friends; and his present admirers at Richmond gave him such a reception as Southern gentlemen give to their friends. [Laughter and applause.] What further has been done by us? No, I have no right to claim any portion of it. What has been done by the merchants of New York? The *George Griswold* goes out to feed the starving poor of Lancashire, to which yourselves all contributed, and it was only God's blessing on that charity that prevented that vessel being overhauled and burned by the pirate *Alabama*, fitted out from an English port. [Applause.] And to-day, at Birkenhead, the *Sumter* is being fitted out—at Barbadoes the captain of the *Florida* is being *feted*—and somewhere the "290," the cabalistic number of the British merchants who contributed to her construction, is preying upon our commerce, while we hear that at Glasgow a steamer is being built for the Emperor of China—[laughter]—and at Liverpool another is about to be launched for the Emperor of China. Pardon me, I don't believe the Emperor of China will buy many ships of Great Britain, until they bring back the silk gowns they stole out of his palace at Pekin. [Laughter and great applause.] And even now, I say that our commerce is being preyed upon, by ships in the hands of the rebels, built by English builders. [Cries of "That's so."] And I ask the merchants of the city of New York whether it has not already reached the point where our commerce, to be safe, has to be carried in British bottoms. [Great laughter.] Now, I learn from the late correspondence of Earl Russell, that the British have put two articles of the treaty of Paris in compact with the rebels—first, that enemies' goods shall be covered by neutral flags, and there shall be free trade at the ports, and open trade with neutrals. Why didn't Great Britain put the other part of the treaty in compact; namely, that there should be no more privateering! if she was honest and earnest? Again, when we took from her deck our two senators and rebel embassadors, Slidell and Mason, and took them, in my judgment, according to the laws of nations, what did she do but threaten us with war? I agree that it was wisely done, perhaps, not to provoke war at that time—we were not quite in a condition for it—but I thank God, and that always, that we are fast getting in a condition to remember that always and every day! [Tremendous applause, and waiving of handkerchiefs, and cries of "Good!"] Why is it all this has been done? Because we alone can be the commercial rivals of Great Britain! and because the South has no commercial marine. There has been, in my judgment, a deliberate attempt on the part of Great Britain, under the plea of neutrality, to allow our commerce to be ruined,

if human actions indicate human thoughts. [Cries of "That is so."] It is idle to tell me Great Britain does not know these vessels are fitted out in her ports. It is idle and insulting to tell me that she put the *Alabama* under $20,000 bonds, not to go into the service of the Confederate States. The *Jacob Bell* alone would pay the amount of the bond over and over again. We did not so deal with her when she was at war with Russia. On the suggestion of the British Minister, our Government stopped, with the rapidity of lightning, the sailing of a steamer, until the minister himself was willing to let her go. We must take some means to put a stop to these piracies, and to the fitting out of pirate vessels in English ports. They are always telling us about the inefficiency of a republican government, but as they are acting now, we could stop two pirates to her one. [Applause.] We must, in some way, put a stop to the construction and fitting out of these pirate vessels in English ports to prey upon our commerce, or else consent to keep our ships at home. We must stop them—we must act through the people of England, if we cannot secure a stoppage in any other way. [Applause.] I have seen it stated that the loss to our commerce already amounts to $9,000,000—enough to have paid the expense of keeping a large number of vessels at home, and out of the way of these cruisers. What shall we do in the matter? Why, when our Government takes a step toward putting a stop to it, (and I believe it is taking that step now, but it is not in my province to speak of it,) we must aid it in so doing. [Great applause.] We are the Government in this matter, and when our Government gets ready to take a step, we must get ready to sustain it. [Applause.] England told us what to do when we took Mason and Slidell, and she thought there was a likelihood to be a war. She stopped exportation of those articles which she thought we wanted, and which she had allowed to be exported before. Let us do the same thing. [Applause.] Let us proclaim non-intercourse, so that no ounce of food shall ever by any accident get into an Englishman's mouth, until these piracies cease. [Laughter and applause.]

[A voice: "Say that again!"]

Gen. Butler: I never say anything, my friends, that I am afraid to say again. [Applause.] I repeat—let us proclaim non-intercourse, so that no ounce of food shall by any accident get into an Englishman's mouth, until these piracies are stopped. [Applause.] That we have a right to do; and when we ever do do it, my word for it, they will find out where these vessels are going to, and they will write to the Emperor of China upon the subject. [Applause.] But I hear some objector say, "If you proclaim non-intercourse, England may go to war." Now, I am not to be frightened twice running. [Laughter.] I got frightened a little better than a year ago, but I got over it. [Great laughter.] But further, this is a necessity; for we must keep our ships at home in some form to save them from these piracies, when a dozen of these privateers get loose upon the seas. It becomes a war measure which any nation, under any law, under any construction, would warrant our right to enforce. And this course should be adopted toward the English nation, for I have never heard of any blockade runners under the French flag, nor under the Russian flag—nor under the Austrian flag—nor under the Greek flag. No! not even the Turks will do it. [Applause.] And, therefore, I have ventured to suggest the adoption of this course, for your consideration as a possible, aye, not only possible, but, unless the thing has a remedy, a *probable* event: for we must see to it that we protect ourselves and take a manly place among the nations of the earth. [Applause.] But I hear some friend of mine say, "I am afraid your scheme would bring down our provisions; and if we didn't export them to England we should find our western market still more depressed." Allow me, with great deference to your judgment, gentlemen, to suggest a remedy for that at the same time. I would suggest that the exportation of gold be prohibited, and then there would be nothing to forward to meet the bills of exchange and pay for the goods we have bought, except our provisions. And, taking a hint from one of your best and most successful merchants, we could pay for our silks and satins in butter, and lard, and corn, and beef, and pork, and bring up the prices in the West, so that they could afford to pay the increased tariff now rendered necessary, I suppose, upon your railroads. [Applause.] And if our fair sisters and daughters will dress in silks, and satins, and laces, they will not feel any more troubled that a portion of the price goes to the Western farmer to enhance his gains, instead of going into the coffers of a Jew banker in Wall street. [Applause.] You will observe, my friends, that in the list of grievances with which I charge England, I have not charged her with tampering with our leading politicians. [Laughter.] So far as any evidence I have, I don't know that she is guilty, but what shall we say of our leading politicians that have tampered with her? [Laughter.] I have read of it with much surprise—with more surprise than has been excited in me by any other fact of this war. I had, somehow, got an inkling of the various things that came up in previous instances. I was not very much surprised at them, but when I read a statement, deliberately put forward, that here, in New York—leading politicians had consulted with the British minister as to how this United States could be separated, every drop of blood in my veins boiled; and I would have liked to have seen that leading politician. [Tremendous applause.] I do not know that Lord Lyons is to blame. I suppose, sir, if a man comes to one of your clerks and offers to go into partnership with him to rob your neighbor's bank, and he reports him to you, you do not blame the clerk; but what do you do with the man who makes the offer? [Laughter.]

[A voice: "Hang him!"]

I think we had better take a lesson from the action of Washington's administration—when the French minister, M. Genet, undertook even to

address the people of the United States by letter, complaint was made to his government, and he was recalled, and a law was passed preventing, for all future time, any interference by foreign diplomatists with the people of the United States—I want to be understood—I have no evidence of any interference on the part of Lord Lyons; but he said that, both before and after a certain event, leading politicians came to him and desired that he would do what—(I am giving the substance and not words)—desired that he would request his Government not to interfere. Why? Because it would aid the country not to interfere? No! Because, if they did interfere, the country would spurn the interference, and be stronger than ever to crush the rebellion. Mark again the insidious way in which the point was put. They knew how we felt because of the action of England—they knew that the heart of this people beat true to the Constitution, and that it could not brook any interference on the part of England. What, then, did these politicians do? They asked the British Minister to use the influence of British diplomacy to induce other nations to interfere, but to take care that Great Britain should keep out of sight, lest we should see the cat under the meal. [Laughter.] This is precisely the proposition that they made. You observe, that in speaking of these men, I have, up to this moment, used the word politicians: What kind of politicians? [A voice: "Copperheads." Hisses and groans] They cannot be Democratic politicians. ["Of course, they cannot."] How I should like to hear Andrew Jackson say a few words upon such politicians who call themselves Democrats! ["He would hang them."] No, I don't think he would have an opportunity to do so; he never would be able to catch them. [Laughter.] I have felt it my duty here in the city of New York, because of the interest I have in public affairs, to call attention to this most extraordinary fact—that there are men in the community so lost to patriotism, so bound up in the traditions of party, so selfish, as to be willing to tamper with Great Britain in order to bring about the separation of this country. It is the most alarming fact that I have yet seen. I had rather see a hundred thousand men set in the field on the rebel side—aye, I had rather see Great Britain armed against us openly, as she is covertly—than to be forced to believe that there are amongst us such men as these, lineal descendants of Judas Iscariot, intermarried with the race of Benedict Arnold. ["Wood," "Brooks."] It has shown me a great danger with which we are threatened, and I call upon all true men to sustain the Government—to be loyal to the Government. [Loud cheers.] As you, Sir, were pleased to say, the present Government was not the Government of my choice—I did not vote for it, or for any part of it; but it is the Government of my country, it is the only organ by which I can exert the force of the country to protect its integrity; and as long as I believe that Government to be honestly administered, I will throw a mantle over any mistakes that I may think it has made, and support it heartily, with hand and purse, so help me God! [Prolonged cheering.] I have no loyalty to any man or men; my loyalty is to the Government; and it makes no difference to me who the people have chosen to administer the Government, so long as the choice has been constitutionally made, and the persons so chosen hold their places and powers. I am a traitor and a false man if I falter in my support. [Applause.] This is what I understand to be loyalty to a Government; and I was sorry to learn, as I did the other day, that there was a man in New York who professed not to know the meaning of the word loyalty. [Hisses, groans, and cries of "Wood."] I desire to say here that it is the duty of every man to be *loyal* to the Government, to sustain it, to pardon its errors, and help it to rectify them, and to do all he can to aid it in carrying the country on in the course of glory and grandeur in which it was started by our fathers. And let me say to you, my friends—to you, young men, that no man who opposed his country in time of war ever prospered. ["That's so."] The Tory of the Revolution, the Hartford Conventionist of 1812, the immortal seven who voted against the supplies for the Mexican War—all history is against these men. Let no politician of our day put himself in the way of the march of this country to glory and greatness, for whoever does so will surely be crushed. The course of our nation is onward, and let him who opposes it beware.

"The mower mowes on—though the adder may writhe,
Or the copperhead curl round the blade of his scythe."

[Loud applause.] It only remains, sir, for me to repeat the expression of my gratitude to you and the citizens of New York here assembled, for the kindness with which you and they have received me and listened to me, for which, please, again accept my thanks. [Prolonged cheering.]

At the conclusion of Gen. BUTLER's address the Glee Club sang with fine effect, an original patriotic song, which was received with general favor by the audience, who then called variously for BRADY, VAN BUREN, and other popular favorites; but, in accordance with the plan of the evening, the Mayor promptly adjourned the meeting, while hundreds availed themselves of the opportunity to shake Gen. BUTLER by the hand, and congratulate him on his absolute refutation of the slanders of the rebels of the South and the Copperheads of the North.

Loyal Leagues, Clubs, and Newsvenders will be furnished with any of the Society's publications at the actual cost price.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

No. 8.

SEPARATION:

WAR WITHOUT END.

By M. Edouard Laboulaye,

MEMBER OF THE INSTITUTE.

NEW YORK:

WM. C. BRYANT & CO., PRINTERS, 41 NASSAU STREET, CORNER OF LIBERTY.

1863.

NATIONAL UNITY.

IT MUST NOT BE SURRENDERED.

[*From the N. Y. "Evening Post," Feb.* 7, 1863.]

New York, February 7th, 1863.

To Parke Godwin, Esq.:

I send you herewith a translation from the French of a remarkable paper, originally published in the *Revue Nationale* of Paris. It has seemed to me that, in this critical hour of our national history, no better service could be rendered the country than to give it, in our own language, the widest circulation amongst the people. To this end may I not ask you to give it a place in the columns of the *Evening Post?*

The author is M. Edouard Laboulaye, member of the Institute and Professor of *Legislation Comparée* in the College of France—a man holding the highest position in the first institution of the world, the University of France—and whose whole life has been devoted to the study of the subject of which he writes.

It may not be generally known that the lectures of the professors in all the colleges and schools of the University of France are open and free to all who may chose to attend them, so that the *seances* of such men as Laboulaye, Michelet, Quinet, and other eminent scholars and scientists are crowded by the most thoughtful of the men and women of all the nations of the world, who make Paris their resort for the winter.

I have before me a letter from a French liberalist, of high character and attainments, now a resident of the United States, who has himself had the advantage of a personal intercourse with M. Laboulaye, in which he says: "For the last two years scarcely has he, in his *chaire de legislation comparee*, given one of his eloquent lectures without introducing the United States —their greatness, their constitution, their trials, and their destinies. It is by thus particularizing his teachings that he has aroused for America a universal interest, for no week passes that the learned professor has not around his desk representatives from all the nations of Europe. Even ladies of all ranks and countries—English, Russians, Germans and Spaniards—seated there, side by side with the students of the *Quartier Latin*, listen to and applaud his eloquent and earnest advocacy of American nationality and free institutions."

M. Laboulaye himself relates the incident by which his thoughts and sympathies were first turned towards the people and the institutions of the United States. Everybody who has been in Paris will remember the long rows of wooden trays, filled with the strangest jumble of old books, that stretch along the river edge of the Quai Voltaire, and the other contiguous quais on that side of the Seine. One may find there books in all the languages of the world, and sometimes stray copies of very rare works. Well, one day, now several years ago, M. Laboulaye amused himself with rummaging amongst the old books exposed for sale on the Quai Voltaire. His eye caught the title of a book in English; he took it up, opened it, read a few moments, demanded its price, paid it, some few sous, and with his eyes still fixed upon its open pages, resumed his walk towards the Champs Elysée. Arrived there, he seated himself upon one of the numerous chairs always ready to be hired, and continued to read on until the last page of his new acquisition was finished; and then, instead of returning home,

he went in a state of great excitement to M. Armand Bertin, at that time editor-in-chief of the *Journal des Debats*, and on meeting him exclaimed: "Congratulate me, I have to-day put my hand on a great man." And such was the enthusiasm with which he spoke of his new discovery, that M. Bertin begged him to make his "great man" at once known to France. M. Laboulaye, without delay, set to work, and in a few days there appeared, in successive numbers of the *Journal des Debats*, three masterly articles. The first was "on the works of Dr. Wm. Ellery Channing," for it was a stray volume of his sermons that M. Laboulaye had purchased on the Quai Voltaire, and he was the "great man" upon whom he "put his hand" that day. The second article was entitled, "The Progress of Religious Ideas in New England," and the last, "The Present Condition and Probable Future of the Great Republic."

The stray seed of the New England Puritan Reformer took deep root, and from that day to this M. Laboulaye has been an earnest student of American ideas and institutions, and on all occasions, and before all men, the unswerving friend and courageous advocate of the people and government of the Union.

A previous article of M. Laboulaye, originally published in the *Journal des Debats*, entitled "A View of the Causes and Aims of the Rebellion," had a wide circulation in this country through the columns of the *Evening Post* and other public journals, and exerted no little influence upon the formation of a just public opinion, here as well as abroad, as to the true character of the slave-masters' conspiracy to overthrow democratic institutions on this continent.

These latest pregnant words of the distinguished publicist reach us at the very moment of their greatest need. At a moment when the public patience seems well nigh exhausted; when here at the north, even the most loyal seem to lose heart and to doubt, and the disloyal, under the guise of conservatism

and in the name of democracy, taking courage, strive so much the more, to bewilder and divide public opinion and confound the judgments of the people upon questions vital to national salvation. At this critical moment there comes from the other side of the Atlantic, from the home of Lafayette and Rochambeau, an answer so direct, so pointed and so conclusive, to the most nefarious of the sophistries of the northern parasites of the slave-power, that it cannot fail to aid in confounding their shameless attempt to shift the guilt of the war from the shoulders of their southern masters and to lay it upon those of the people of New England. This most enlightened and impartial student of American affairs, looking at the whole great conflict, from its inception to the present hour, with a single eye to discover the truth, declares that "the South alone is guilty."

But this is by no means the chief point of M. Laboulaye's argument. To yield the dissolution of the national unity—"the rending asunder of the country," that, in his view, is "the one irreparable degradation." "An abdication," he says, "so shameful, for a people accustomed to liberty, is not even to be thought of, so long as there remains a single man or a single dollar to risk in the struggle to keep the inheritance of the fathers."

And this is the momentous point which, I think, you, and all men like you, who have the ability to speak and a great audience who wait daily upon your words, should press home upon the minds and hearts of the people and their rulers.

For any people to permit themselves to meditate the possibility of a surrender of their nationality, indicates a condition of demoralization, which foretells the approach of utter national decay, the coming on of the final shame. But for a people so planted, so nutured by the Divine Providences, so illustrated by the heroic characters and deeds of their great founders, as

the people of the United States—for such a people, in the very bloom of their prime, to yield up their national unity at the arrogant demand of a few thousand slave-masters, would be such an ineffaceable stain upon free institutions, upon democratic citizenship, upon Christian civilization, upon human nature itself, as is not to be paralleled in the history of the world. The ignominious delinquency and partition of Poland would be a national glory compared with it. And yet to-day, even here in the North, not to speak of the abettors of the great treason—the genuine spawn of the Tories of 1776—there are men calling themselves loyal, who begin to quail and to hint at a possible time for surrender—at a possible time to defile the graves and desecrate the memories of Washington, of Adams, of Jefferson, of Hamilton and their great compeers.

I know that the Supreme Ruler of the Ages, has always "the stones" out of which he can "raise up children unto Abraham"—new and faithful nations. Are we to have no other significance in the history of the race, but to illustrate these portentous words of the Divine Master of these Christian centuries?

How many years of almost hopeless toil and bloody sweat did the fathers devote to the acquisition of the great inheritance, to maintain which we have given but less than two, of bewildered and oftentimes aimless preparation? From the meeting of that first Congress of the American people, in this city of New York, in 1765, in which "the brave and noble-hearted" Gadsden, of South Carolina, gave utterance to the first grand formula of American nationality—"Away with your royal charters, and let us stand on the broad, common ground of those natural rights that we all feel and know as men; no more New Englanders, no more New Yorkers on this continent; but all of us Americans"—from that hour onward until 1789, when the people of the United States, in their own common name, estab-

lished and set in motion a national constitution, the great struggle went on. The men of the first revolution, almost without means, surrounded by all manner of perils, and backed by comparatively but a handful of loyal people, waged a struggle of twenty-four years for the right of independent national existence; a right which, in their judgment, involved all other human rights and interests—social, civil, and political—peace, prosperity, and glory. And in this struggle, let it not be forgotten, was included a bloody war of seven years—Valley Forge and all. Less than three millions of people, without ships, without arms or munitions, without money or credit, but only with an earnest will and stout hearts, against the first naval and military power of the world, fighting for a great idea, for that pearl without price, Liberty, to be set in the golden band of national unity.

National Unity: that is the muniment of title to the inheritance transmitted by the fathers, and which the American people to-day stand pledged before the world, to keep intact in all its integrity, both of exterior estate and of interior idea, at the cost of the last dollar of their wealth and the last drop of their blood. Such, at least, is the judgment of all the enlightened and true friends of freedom and humanity, confirmed by the universal sense of the people, of all the civilized nations of the world.

We must not, we cannot falter, without incurring their contempt, and the curses of our own posterity to the remotest generations.

Your friend,

JAMES McKAYE.

DISUNION:

DEGRADATION WITHOUT REMEDY.

FROM THE "REVUE NATIONALE."

The civil war which for two years past has divided and devastated the United States has produced its evil consequences in Europe also. The scarcity of cotton occasions great suffering. The workmen of Rouen and Mulhouse suffer no less than the spinners and weavers of Lancashire. Whole populations are reduced to beggary, and have no resource, or hope of sustenance during the winter, but private charity or aid from the government. In such a cruel crisis—in the midst of such unmerited sufferings—it is natural that the public opinion of Europe should be unsettled, and that they who prolong the fratricidal war should be charged with culpable ambition. Peace in America, peace at any price, is the urgent need; is the cry f thousands of men among us who are pinched with hunger, the innocent victims of the passions and resentments that embrue in blood the United States.

These complaints are but too well founded. The world today is a compact of mutual interests and obligations. For modern nations, therefore, who live by industry, peace is a necessary condition of existence. But unfortunately, if it is easy to indicate the remedy, to apply it is almost impossible. Until now, it is only by means of war that we could hope to reach the end of the war. To throw ourselves with arms in our hands between the combatants, for the purpose of imposing a truce upon them, would be an enterprise in which Europe would exhaust all her resources, and to what end? As Mr. Cobden has justly said, "It would be far cheaper to feed the laboring classes, who are now starving in consequence of the American crisis, on game and champagne wine."

To offer to-day a peaceful intervention would be to expose ourselves to a refusal, if it did not even exasperate one of the parties and provoke it to measures of violence. It would lessen, too, the chances of our mediation being accepted at a more favorable moment. We are thus forced to remain spectators of a deplorable war, which causes us innumerable evils. We can only pray that exhaustion or suffering may at last appease the maddened combatants, and oblige them to accept reunion or separation. A sad position undoubtedly, but one which neutral powers have at all times been obliged to accept, and from which we cannot escape but at the risk of unknown perils.

But if we have not the right to interfere, we have at least that of complaining, and of seeking to discover who is really guilty of this war, which so disturbs our well-being. The opinion of Europe is something. It may hasten events and bring about peace better than bayonets. Unfortunately, for two years, public opinion in Europe has been led astray and has taken a false direction. In arraying itself on the wrong side, it but prolongs the resistance, instead of arresting it.

The South has found numerous and skilful advocates in France and England. They have presented her cause as that of justice and liberty. They have proclaimed the right of separation, and have not quailed even before the necessity of apologizing for slavery. To-day these arguments begin to loose their force. Thanks to a few writers who do not chaffer with the great interests of humanity—thanks, above all, to M. DE GASPARIN, light has begun to break forth. We know now what to think of the origin and character of the rebellion. To every impartial observer it is now evident that the wrong lies wholly with the South. It is not necessary to be a Montesquieu to comprehend that a portion of a people, whose rights are in no way endangered, but who are led by pride and ambition to attempt the destruction of national unity and to rend assunder the country, have no claim to the sympathy of the French people. As to canonizing slavery, that is a work we must leave to southern preachers. Not all the ingenuity of the world will ever be able to retrieve that lost cause. Even if the confederates had a thousand reasons for complaining and revolting, there must always remain an ineffaceable stain on their rebel-

lion. No Christian, no liberal thinker, can ever interest himself in men who, in the middle of the nineteenth century, openly and audaciously proclaim their wish to perpetuate and extend slavery. The planters themselves, may indeed listen to theories which have intoxicated and ruined them; but no such sophistries can ever cross the ocean.

The advocates of the South have rendered her a fatal service. They have made her believe that Europe, enlightened or misled, would take sides with her and would finally throw into the scales something more than sterile wishes. This delusion has encouraged and still encourges the resistance of the South. It prolongs the war and our sufferings. If, from the first, as the North had a right to expect, the friends of liberty had boldly declared themselves against the policy of slavery—if the partisans of maritime peace—if the defenders of the rights of neutrals, had spoken in favor of the Union—had discouraged a separation which could only benefit England, it is probable that the South would have entered with less temerity upon a road without an outlet. If, in spite of the courage and devotion of her soldiers, if, after all the skill of her generals, the South fails in an enterprise, which, in my opinion, cannot be too often denounced, let her lay the fault at the door of those who had so poor an esteem for Europe, as to imagine that they could suborn its public opinion to serve a political scheme, against which patriotism protests, and which the gospel and humanity alike condemn.

"Granted," say they, "that the South is wholly in the wrong; but, after all, she is determined to separate. She can no longer live with the North. The war itself, whatever may be its origin, is a new cause of disunion. By what right can twenty millions of men oblige ten millions* of their compatriots to continue a detested alliance, to respect a contract which they are resolved to break at any cost? Is it possible to imagine that two or three years of strife and misery will make the conquered and the conquerors live peaceably together? Can a country, two or three times as large as France, be subju-

---

* And of these ten millions there are four millions of slaves, whose wishes are not consulted.

gated? Would there not be always ill blood between the parties? Separation is perhaps a misfortune, but to-day the misfortune is irreparable. Let it be admitted that the North has the law, the letter and the spirit of the constitution on her side, there remains always an undebateable point: the South wills to be master at the South. You have not the right to crush a people that fights so bravely. Resign yourselves."

If we were less enervated by the luxuries of modern life and by the idleness of a long peace, if our hearts still retained some remnant of that patriotism which, in 1792, sent our forefathers to the shores of the Rhine, the answer would be an easy one. To-day I fear we can no longer comprehend it. If to-morrow the south of France should revolt and demand separation, if Alsace and Lorraine wished to isolate themselves, what would be, I do not say our right, but our duty? Would we stop to count votes, to know if a third or a half of the French people had a right to destroy the national unity, to annihilate France, to rend in fragments the glorious heritage bought with the blood of our fathers? No, we would take up our muskets and march. Woe to him who does not feel that his country is sacred, and that it is glorious to defend it, even at the cost of all possible sufferings and dangers.

"America is not France; it is a confederation, it is not a nation." Who says that? The South, to justify her crime. The North says the contrary, and for two years, at the price of sacrifices without number, affirms that the people of the United States are one people, and that their country shall not be cut in two. This is noble. This is grand, and what astonishes me is, that France can remain unmoved in view of such patriotism. Love of country—is not that the distinguishing virtue of the French people?

What, then, is the South, and whence does she derive this right of separation, so loudly proclaimed? Is it a conquered people that seeks to recover its independence, like Lombardy? Is it a distinct race that wishes no longer to continue an oppressive alliance? No, they are communities of planters established by American hands, on the territories of the Union, who revolt without any other reason than their own ambition. Let us take a map of the United States. If we except Virginia, the

two Carolinas, and Georgia, which were originally English colonies, all the rest of the South is settled upon lands bought and paid for by the Union. That is to say, the North has borne the greatest part of the expense. Louisiana was sold to the United States in 1804, by the first consul, for fifteen millions of dollars. Florida was purchased of Spain in 1820, for about five millions. The Mexican war, with its cost of a billion of money and its cruel losses, was necessary to secure Texas. In short, of all the rich territories that border the Mississippi and the Missouri from their source to their mouth, there is not one inch but has been paid for by the Union, and therefore belongs to it. It is the Union that has driven out or indemnified the Indians. It is the Union that has built all the forts, the docks, the lighthouses, and harbors. It is the Union that made all these desert places of value, and rendered colonization possible. Northern as well as Southern men cleared and planted these lands, and transformed into flourishing States these sterile solitudes. Can old Europe, where unity is everywhere the result of conquest, show us a title to property so sacred as this? A country more entirely the common work of a whole people? And now, shall a minority be permitted to appropriate a territory which belongs to all, and to choose for themselves the best part of it? Can a minority be permitted to destroy the Union and to imperil its first benefactors, without whom, indeed, it could not exist? To say that this revolt is not impious, is to say that caprice constitutes right.

It is not, however, a political reason only, which opposes the separation. Its geography, the situation of the different portions, obliges the United States to form one nation. Strabo, contemplating the vast country we now call France, said, with the foresight of genius, that beholding the nature of the territory and the courses of the streams, it was evident that the forests of Gaul, then thinly inhabited, would become the home of a great people. Nature had prepared our territory to become the theatre of a great civilization. This is no less true of America. She is, in truth, only a double valley with an imperceptible head-level and two great water courses, the Mississippi and the St. Lawrence. No high mountains which separate and isolate peoples; no natural barriers like the Alps and Pyrenees.

The West cannot live without the Mississippi—to possess the mouth of the river is for the farmers of the West a question of life and death.

The United States have felt this from the first. When the Ohio and Mississippi were still only streams lost in the great forests of the Southwest—when the first planters were but a handful of men scattered over the wilderness, the Americans knew already that New Orleans was the key of the whole country. They would not leave it in possession of Spain or France. Napoleon understood this. He held in his hands the future greatness of the United States. It did not displease him to cede to America this vast territory, with the intention, he said, of giving to England a maritime rival which sooner or later would humble the pride of our enemy. He might have dispossessed himself merely of the left bank of the river, and thus have satisfied the United States, who at that time asked no more; but he did more (and here I think he was very wrong), he renounced, with a stroke of the pen, a country as vast as half of Europe, and gave up our last right to the beautiful river, we had ourselves discovered. Very soon sixty years will have elapsed since this cession. The states now called Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, Oregon, the territories of Nebraska, Dacotah, Jefferson, and Washington, which will soon become states, have been established on the immense domain abandoned by Napoleon. Without counting the slave-holding population, which seeks to destroy the Union, there are ten millions of freemen between Pittsburg and Fort Union, who claim the course and mouth of the Mississippi as having been ceded to them by France. It is from us that they hold their title and their possession. They have the right of sixty years' occupancy—a right consecrated by labor and cultivation—a right derived from a solemn contract, and better still, from nature and from God. And for defending this right, we reproach them. They are usurpers and tyrants, because they will not put themselves at the mercy of an ambitious minority. What should we say if to-morrow, Normandy, in rebellion, should claim as her own Rouen and Havre? And yet, what is the course of the Seine compared to that of the Mississippi, which extends two thousand two hundred and fifty miles, and

receives as tributaries all the waters of the West? To possess New Orleans is to command a valley which comprises two-thirds of the United States. "We will neutralize the river," they say. We all know what such promises are worth. We have seen what Russia did with the mouth of the Danube. The Crimean war was necessary that Germany might regain the free use of her great river. If to-morrow a new war should break out between Austria and Russia, we may be sure that the possession of the Danube would be the stake of the contest.

It cannot be otherwise in America from the day when the Mississippi, for hundreds of leagues, shall flow between two slave-holding shores. Already the effect of the war has been to stop the exportation of wheat and corn, the riches of the West.

In 1861 it became necessary to burn the useless crops, to the great injury of Europe, who is the gainer by these exports. The South understands so thoroughly the strength of her position, that her ambition is to separate the valley of the Mississippi from the Eastern States, to unite herself with the West, and to condemn thus the Yankees of New England to a ruinous isolation. The Confederates use the Mississippi as a bait by which they hope to reconstruct, profitably to themselves—that is to say, in the INTERESTS OF SLAVERY—the Union which they have broken up through FEAR OF LIBERTY.

We see, then, what to think of the pretended tyranny of the North; what truth there is in the assertion that she wishes to oppress and subjugate the South. On the contrary, the North only defends herself. In maintaining the Union, it is her RIGHT, it is her EXISTENCE that she would save.

Thus far I have spoken in the name of the material interests only—legitimate interests, and which, founded on solemn titles, constitutes a sacred right; but if we examine the moral and political interests—interests of a superior order—we shall see still more clearly that the North cannot yield without self-destruction.

The United States are a Republic, the freest and at the same time the mildest and happiest government that the world has ever seen. In what consists this prosperity of the Americans? They are alone upon an immense territory; they have never been obliged to concentrate power and weaken liberty, for the purpose of resisting the ambition and jealousy of

their neighbors. In the United States there was no standing army, no great war navy. The immense sums spent by us to avoid or maintain war were used by the Americans to establish schools—in giving to every citizen, rich or poor, that education, that instruction which constitutes the moral grandeur and the true riches of a people. Their foreign policy was contained in a single maxim. Never to intermeddle in the political quarrels of Europe on the sole condition that Europe would never interfere in their affairs, and would respect the liberty of the seas.

Thanks to those wise principles, bequeathed to them by Washington, in his immortal Farewell Address, the United States have enjoyed for eighty years a peace undisturbed but once, in 1812, when they were obliged to withstand England and maintain the rights of neutrals. For the last seventy years, we have spent billions to maintain our liberty or our preponderance in Europe. The United States have employed these billions in ameliorations of all kinds. That is the secret of their prodigious success; their isolation has made their prosperity.

Suppose, now, that this separation should be accomplished, and that the new confederacy should comprise all the slave-states; the North loses at once her POWER and her INSTITUTIONS. The Republic is stabbed to the heart. There would be in America two rival nations, always on the eve of conflict. Peace would by no means extinguish enmities. It would not obliterate the memories of past greatness, nor of the UNION DESTROYED.

The South victorious would be doubtless no less a friend of slavery, no less in love with dominion, than in former times. The enemies of slavery, now masters of their own policy, would not surely be made more moderate by separation. What would the Southern Confederacy be to the North? A foreign power established in America, with a frontier of fifteen hundred miles—a frontier open on all sides, and consequently, always threatening or threatened. This power, hostile by reason of its vicinity, and still more so on acconnt of its institutions, would possess some of the most important portions of the New World. She would own half of the sea-coasts of the Union—she would command the Gulf of Mexico, an inland sea one third the size of the Mediterranean. She would be mistress of the mouth of

the Mississippi, and could at her will ruin the people of the West. The remnant of the old Union must, then, always maintain an attitude of defense towards their rivals. Custom-house and frontier difficulties, rivalries, jealousies—all the scourges of old Europe, would at once overwhelm America. It would be necsssary to establish custom-houses over an extent of five hundred leagues—to construct and arm forts along this immense frontier, support a large standing army and navy. In other words—they must renounce the old constitution—weaken municipal independence and concentrate power. Adieu then to the old and glorious liberty! Adieu to those institutions which made America the common country of all those who lacked a breathing place in Europe. The work of Washington would be utterly destroyed, and the new condition of things would be full of difficulty and of peril. I understand how such a future might rejoice the people who can never pardon America her prosperity and her grandeur. History is full of these deplorable jealouses. But I understand, even still better how a people accustomed to liberty should risk their last man and their last dollar to keep the inheritance of their fathers, and I respect it. What I do not comprehend is, that there should be found in Europe, people, calling themselves liberal, who reproach the North for her courageons resistance, and counsel a shameful abdication. The war is a terrible evil; but from the war a durable peace may spring. The South may be worn out by an exhausting struggle. The old Union may be again restored—the future may be saved. But what can be the issue of separation, if not WAR WITHOUT END and miseries without number? The dismemberment of the Union—the rendering asunder of the country, would be a DEGRADATION WITHOUT REMEDY. A fate so shameful is to be accepted, only, when one is utterly crushed out and trodden under foot.

So far I have argued on the hypothesis that the South would remain an independent power. But unless the West should join the Confederates, re-establishing a Union which should exclude New England, this independence is a chimera. It might last a few years, but in ten or twenty years, when the West shall have doubled or tripled its free population, what will the Confederacy be—weakened, per force, by servile cultiva-

tion—compared to a people of thirty millions of men shutting her in on two sides? In self-defence the South would be forced to lean on Europe. Her existence would depend on her being protected by a maritime power. England alone is in a condition to guaranty her sovereignty. This would be a new danger for free America and for Europe. There is no navy in the South, and with slavery there never will be any. England at once would seize the monopoly of cotton, and would furnish the South with capital and ships. In two words, the triumph of the South is the re-establishment of England on the continent, whence she was driven by the policy of Louis Sixteenth and Napoleon. It weakens neutrals, it entangles France again, in all those vexed questions of liberty of the seas, which have cost us already two centuries of struggle and suffering. The American Union, while defending its own rights, had assured the freedom of the seas. The Union destroyed, English supremacy would revive again. It is peace banished from the world; it is a return to a policy which has so far only favored our rivals.

This is what Napoleon felt to be true—this is what we forget to-day. It would seem as if history were merely a collection of pleasant stories to amuse children. No one is willing to understand the lessons of the past. If the experience of our fathers was not lost upon our ignorance, we should see that in defending her own independence, and in maintaining the national unity, the North defends our cause as well as her own. All our prayers would be for the triumph of our old and faithful friends. To weaken the United States will be to weaken ourselves. At the first quarrel with England we shall regret, but too late, that we abandoned a policy which for forty years has been the guaranty of our own safety.

In writing these pages, I do not expect to convert those who have in their hearts an innate sympathy for slavery. I write for those honest souls, who allow themselves to be enticed by the great words of national independence, paraded before their eyes purposely to deceive and delude them. The South has never been threatened. To-day she might come back into the Union, even with her slaves. It is only demanded of her not to destroy the national unity, and not to subvert liberty. We cannot repeat it too often: the North is not the aggressor. It only defends, as every true citizen should, the national com-

pact, the integrity of the country. It is sad that it has found so little support in Europe, and especially in France. They relied on us—in us they placed their trust—and we have abandoned them as if the sacred words of COUNTRY and of LIBERTY no longer awoke a response in our hearts What has become of the days when the whole of France applauded the young Lafayette, as he buckled on his sword in the cause o America? Who has imitated him, who has recalled that glorious memory? Have we grown so old as to have forgotten all that?

What will be the issue of the war? It is impossible to f re see. The South may succeed. The North may be divided and exhausted by intestine strife. The Union is, perhaps, even now, but a great memory. But whatever may be the future, or whatever fortune may attend it, the duty of every man who does not allow himself to be carried away by the success of the present hour, is to sustain and encourage the North to the las —to condemn those whose ambition threatens to destroy the most perfect and the most patriotic work of humanity—to remain faithful to the end of the war, and, even after defeat, to those, who will have fought to the last moment for RIGHT and LIBERTY.

EDOUARD LABOULAYE.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

LOYAL REPRINTS.—No. 9.

THE VENOM AND THE ANTIDOTE.

COPPERHEAD DECLARATIONS.

Read the following declarations of Copperhead speakers, candidates, and newspapers in this State, which show the spirit of the traitors who are now attempting to gain ascendency in New Hampshire for the encouragement of the rebels in their hellish attempt to subvert our noble and beneficent Government:

"If the South need any assistance, *I will go out and assist them*.....*I won't do a thing* to sustain the President, the Administration, Congress, or any of the piratical crew that have control of this Government. *I won't do anything* that can be *interpreted* as *in any way supporting this war*.....I am personally acquainted with Jefferson Davis. I have seen letters from him. He is a man of *wonderful executive power and firmness of will*, and the *only one* who could have *successfully conducted the South through her present struggle*.....President Lincoln is a *knave*, an *imbecile*, a *usurper*, and a *tyrant*, who *curses* the country with his Administration..... Poor, miserable, ignorant, *lousy* negro.....The *blood-thirsty* followers of *beasts*, the *clergy*."—*John H. George, Copperhead Candidate for Congress in 2d District.*

"The *Abolitionists* were a more insidious and dangerous foe than the Southern rebels. *The war had been brought on by the clamor of Abolitionists.* The question now at issue was, *whether the President's Proclamation should be carried out in the emancipation of slaves, or Abolitionism should be put down. The Democratic Party was for putting down the Abolitionists, and maintaining the institution of Slavery undisturbed.* He (Minot) was personally opposed to Abolition, and in *favor of the perpetuity of Slavery. A Convention* should be called *after proclaiming* an *armistice*, for arranging a *Peace* satisfactory to both parties, by *mutual compromise*."—*Josiah Minot, intimate personal and political friend of Pierce, and the chief manager of the Copperhead Party, in a recent speech at Canterbury.*

"Gentlemen, radical *Abolitionism must be put down.* This great and glorious country will be shattered into fragments, if it is not, or else we shall find ourselves at last brought under the iron rule of military despotism."—*Ira A. Eastman, Copperhead Candidate for Governor, in speech of acceptance.*

"I am a REBEL. I was locked up forty days in a jail I never saw the inside of before, because I am in favor of a free government for white people, and not for niggers. SLAVERY IS RIGHT. It cannot be proved that slavery is a sin. Any physician can disprove that position. The forearms of negroes are four inches longer than those of a white man's. They never sprung from Adam. God never made an animal, except a skunk, that smells half so bad. I AM DEATH ON MINISTERS. They have been preaching the negro twenty-five years, but I haven't heard them for ten years, because I haven't been inside of a church for that period. They are always preaching the negro, and in my town they haven't converted any souls for a good many years. Niggers are their breakfast, dinner, supper, and lodging. Go home and vote the Democratic ticket."—*Dr. Nat. Batchelder, a leading Copperhead, and member of the Rockingham County Democratic Committee, in speech at the Democratic State Convention.*

The *Wolfborough News* publishes a communication, in which it is asserted that nineteen-twentieths of the ministers, and four-fifths of those who attend church regularly, vote the Republican ticket; and the writer inquires why this is so. Admitting the facts to be as stated, one of them accounts for the other—the first for the last. The ministers not only vote the Republican ticket, but they are generally *active political fuglers* (on the sly), and preach far more *politics* than *religion* from their *so-called "sacred desks."* The consequence is, Democrats will not go to hear them; they first became disgusted with this shameful and dishonest conduct of the priests, and then as their treachery to duty, principle, and country, became more apparent, the great mass of Democrats instinctively resolved to give them no countenance or support. Here we have the reason for one of the facts stated by the *News* writer—and ample reason it is. As to the reason

for the other—the fact that the mass of ministers are Republicans—*we* account for it upon the principle of natural affinity. A class of men who are ever *meddlesome, scheming, and disposed to rule,* are naturally attracted to a corrupt, unscrupulous, and revolutionary party, which delights in turmoil and public peril, and labors to destroy the institutions of our fathers, in order to ensure their own lease of power, which they use only for the promotion of their own private interests."—*N. H. Patriot, Feb. 16th,* 1863.

"The most startling political crime, the most stupid political blunder, yet known in American history, has now been consummated. The promised Proclamation of Abraham Lincoln to decree the abolition of negro Slavery is laid before the reader this morning." —- *Richmond Examiner, Jan. 7th.*

"The greatest crime ever committed by a Chief Magistrate of a free people has been perpetrated by the President in the promulgation of the Emancipation Proclamation."—*N. H. Patriot, Jan. 7.*

"*It is time for a separation of the country. I have a mind to sell my property and go South.*"—*Daniel Marcy, Copperhead Candidate for Congress in the 1st District.*

"*Rather than that the Emancipation Proclamation should be enforced, and* SLAVERY *be* ABOLISHED, *I would prefer that the* GOVERNMENT *should be* DESTROYED."—*William Burns, Copperhead Candidate for Congress in 3d District, in recent speeches.*

OPINIONS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE SOLDIERS.

The following letter from John A. Preston, of Plymouth, a life-long Democrat, now a member of the 14th N. H. regiment, speaks for itself. The views of Mr. Preston having been misrepresented by the copperheads, he has concluded to set himself right, and has done it. He says:

"Well, now, Mr. Fellows, I am going to write a word about the copperhead. When I read of the copperheads in the Granite State,—the peace party,—when Jeff. says he would not make peace on any conditions whatever with the "Yankees," it makes the blood boil within my veins, to think we came out here to fight for the Government, while they at home are fighting against the Government, and at the same time wishing us defeated, and that we never should return; and when we are enduring the hardships of a soldier, and exposing ourselves to sickness and death, they at home are making political capital out of it. *Such* men—are they for the good of their country? No, for party spirit. God will have a reckoning with the scoundrels. These are the men who will support George for a seat in the halls of Congress. But, sir, if this regiment ever should return to the Granite State, I would recommend that when they come to the New Hampshire line, they charge bayonets and march through the State at double quick, and clean every copperhead out to Canada line. You may think I am rather hard on the "secesh;" but I have seen enough in your State, and I see enough here to convince me that the world would be better off without them. And, sir, I do believe if they would burn them at the stake (the rope, powder, and ball would be too good for their black infamy), I say if they would burn them, it would be the means of doing more good to put down this rebellion, than it would to raise six hundred thousand more of the best troops that ever trod the soil. Let every man shoulder his gun to fight for the old flag; let us arm the negroes; and use every means to put down the serpent, and damned be the man that acts in concert with Jeff. Davis & Co. * * *

"Yours, ever,
"JOHN A. PRESTON,
"Co. H., 14th Regt. N. H. Vols."

The following is from a member of 2d N. H. regiment, who is disabled by wounds and sickness. He writes to a friend in Concord, under date of Feb. 26, 1863:

"I never felt the force of circumstances as I do now. I am fully aware of the great struggle in New Hampshire. I can do no more for my country in the ranks. I feel most anxious to cast my vote against such traitors as you mention in your epistle. Now, if you will be so kind as to see some of the persons who have the control of the check-list in my ward, and get my name on, I will be much obliged. One vote is but a small thing, I know, but it may lead to great results—besides, I must do my duty. You are correct in your belief that 'there are persons using every means to poison the minds of the soldiers.' Indeed, their proper name is 'Legion;' like the poisonous serpent whose name they appropriately bear, they invade the most sacred places, and infuse their deadly poison wherever they find a victim. * * *

"Believe me your friend and fellow-laborer for the right.

"A. F."

A member of the 12th N. H. regiment writes to his friends in Gilmanton, under date of Feb. 27th:

"I would vote for a democrat, as quick as for one of any party, *if he was for the prosecution of*

the war clear to the extreme, in order to preserve our Union. But I cannot see it in the democratic platform, nor in their candidate's speech of acceptance. It is *treason* from beginning to end, and all they look for or hope is to get the power in New Hampshire. Talk of peace at this hour! None but political jackasses will do it. The cry of '*concession* and conciliation,' the '*Constitution as it is, and the Union as it was*'—isn't this good language to deceive those who are a little *shaky*, and haven't got courage, or, in other words, have got a *weak back?* It isn't any use to evade it. We have been grinding the axe that has severed the cords that bound human beings to oppression—beings that are equal by nature to ourselves. We have our duty before us; let us do it fearlessly; do not fold your arms, while our blood is washing the earth of this curse of slavery. Although we have met with defeats on the battlefield, it doesn't prove that our cause is not just Those defeats will, at last, rest on the heads of our enemies, and the traitors, both North and South. * * Now, as fathers, friends, and *men*, vote at the polls on the second Tuesday of March next, not only for yourselves, but for all ages; for you are now making History, a Textbook of Freedom, a Bible of the Rights of Man, forever. * * Let us stand by our good old country, one and all. Friends at home, raise your voice, and vote in its behalf; and we as soldiers will raise our arms in its defence. I hope to hear good news from the New Hampshire election.

"G."

Another Gilmanton man, a member of the 12th Regiment, writes to his brother as follows, under date of Feb. 18th:

"I say sustain the Administration by all means. I have offered my life, and cannot my friends and neighbors give their votes? But be sure and vote for men that will carry out those principles for which you elect them. The only lines that can now be drawn are to be drawn between loyal men and traitors. * * We have had reverses in the army, but I do not think that the Rebels have taken half so much courage from these as they do from a divided North; for at the time of the New York election, the rebel pickets would sing out to ours, to know if they had heard from New York. * * Now, can any honest man lay the blame of the continuation of the war to Abraham Lincoln? Hasn't he done everything that lay in his power to close this thing up? And, as a last resort, he has come out with the Emancipation Proclamation, and now let us fight under this banner of liberty *for all men*, as long as we did without it. If something is not accomplished, then we shall have this consolation, that we have left no stone unturned. The Democratic Party are giving the last dying struggle. They have everything to gain and nothing to lose by working upon the tender hearts of those who have friends out here exposed to death by disease and bullets, and there are so many that live for *self*, and not *principle*, it is not hard to gain victims in this way. Now, I hope the legal voters of New Hampshire will not be biased by party prejudices, but on the 10th day of March next, will elect *patriotic* men to fill the offices."

The following is from a letter of a member of the 12th Regiment to his friends in Concord, under date of Feb. 23d:

"There is quite a feeling in this Regiment, as to how New Hampshire will go next March. If the soldiers could only vote, the Republican party would carry the State by such an overwhelming majority, that such 'Democrats' as John H. George, Dr. Batchelder, Tom Whipple & Co., would take themselves to the ends of the earth and jump off to '*where, de Lord knows where!*' I don't see for my life why the loyal citizens of Concord will allow such a man as John George to dwell among them. If we boys had him out here, we would send to his '*Father down below.*' If the 'Democrats' should succeed in carrying the State, we (the soldiers) would like to take the job of 'cleaning out,' the whole race of them. Only think how they would rejoice at the South, if the so-called 'Democracy' of New Hampshire should be triumphant. God forbid! Every Democratic victory at the North encourages the Rebels, and only draws the halter tighter around our necks. If I could only find words to express my thoughts of those 'Secesh villians'—the Democrats, or 'Copperheads,' as they are more commonly called—I would try and write them for the press. All I can say is, when we 'clean out' the rebels in the South, which I am confident we shall do ere long, we will show their 'friends' at the North what we can do, by sending *them* 'On the other side of Jordan.' I wish that I could be at home to vote, but I cannot. Tell father to be sure and vote. The 'Copperheads' *must not* and *shall not* carry the State.

"I. C. E."

It having been currently reported by the Copperheads that the Deerfield "boys" in the 11th Regiment had, with only two exceptions, turned Democrats, and the repot reaching the brave boys themselves, they were justly indignant, and have sent the following protest. In a private note they say that every one who ever was a Republican, now with Co. B, signed this protest, except one, and that he hid himself in a cellar on the day of the battle of Fredericksburg, and if

the Democrats want him, let them take him. They say that they can face the cannon of the traitors, South, but that they will not be lied about by the aiders and abettors of Treason, North, to help in the unholy work of giving New Hampshire into the hands of Pierce and his co-conspirators. They urge us to win an old-fashioned victory, saying that "a Republican triumph" in the old Granite State would give almost as much joy to the Eleventh, as a victory in the field. Here is their protest:

"NEWPORT NEWS, Feb. 14, 1863.

We, the members of Co. B, 11th N. H. V., to correct the report that has been circulated to the effect that we have renounced Republican and embraced Democratic doctrines, do declare that there is no foundation whatever for the report. We were Republicans when we left Deerfield, we are Republicans now, and, were we permitted to vote, would, as ever, support the same ticket, for we have seen nothing since our connection with the army, neither in the policy of the war or the principles upon which it is conducted, to call for a change in our sentiments. We are willing to support any men or any measures consistent with civilized warfare, which tend to a successful ending of the war; but we are unwilling, we protest against our opponents using such false reports, to our injury or the injury of our country's holy cause. Signed—

Lieut. J. Harris Cram, Sergt. Merrill Johnson, Sergt. Geo. W. Harvey, Sergt. Winthrop A. Hilton, Geo. E. Johnson, John L. B. Thompson, J. H. Batchelder, Rufus P. George, Wm. H. H. Lang, Charles H. Boody, Charles H. Thompson, William H. Parsons, Albert M. Harvey, James Ritchie, William Richie, Sherman F. Hildreth.

LET the men of New Hampshire as they go to the ballot-box on the 10th of March, REMEMBER these words addressed to them by the Fourteenth regiment:

So long as great national peril impends, while war exists, while great armies are marshalled in the field, and the Government is straining every nerve to avert a final catastrophe, common sense teaches that the conduct of FACTIOUS CITIZENS AT THE NORTH, whether combined IN PARTY ORGANIZATIONS or as INDIVIDUALS giving utterance to a fault-finding spirit, is MONSTROUS TREASON. The memories of many battle-fields, drenched with the blood of our noble slain, the sufferings and hardships of those who still survive, ready in defence of our beloved country to obey the soldier's summons to the deadly strife, plead trumpet-tongued AGAINST THE DEEP DAMNATION OF THESE NORTHERN TRAITORS. Our army has a claim upon the moral support of every man who remains at home, and that support will be most rigorously exacted. *If not given willingly now, we lift a warning voice against the dreadful retribution that awaits all recreants when our triumphant hosts shall return to their homes. Whoso soweth to the wind shall reap the whirlwind.*

INDIANA OFFICERS—RESOLUTIONS.

BEAR IN MIND the following patriotic appeal of the Indiana Army Officers—*all* Democrats—in their recent Address to the Democracy of their State:

The Rebels of the South are leaning on the Northern Democracy for support; and it is unquestionably true, that UNJUSTIFIABLE OPPOSITION TO THE ADMINISTRATION *is giving* AID *and* COMFORT *to the* ENEMY. *In the dark hour of our country's trial,* there *is but one road to success* and PEACE, *and that is, to be as firmly united for our Government* as the Rebels are AGAINST IT.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

No. 10.

A FEW WORDS

IN BEHALF OF THE

Loyal Women of the United States.

BY

ONE OF THEMSELVES.

It has lately become the fashion to say that, with regard to their interest in the present most unhappy war, the women of the North have not equalled those of the South in patriotic interest, labors, and sacrifices. The first utterer of this opinion probably aimed at nothing more than a sensational paragraph; for had there been any more serious or earnest intent, some specifications would have been given, that those accused might have had either the opportunity to defend themselves, or valuable hints for their future guidance and incitement to duty. One writer says—and this is as distinct a form of the accusation as any we remember to have met with: "But for the "courage and energy of the women of the South, we believe "the Rebellion would not have survived to this time. Had "the women of the North with like zeal addressed themselves "to the work of encouraging a loyal and devoted spirit among "us, the copperhead conspiracy in behalf of the enemy would "have been strangled at its birth, and the rebels would have "learned, long ago, the futility of expecting aid and comfort "from such a source." This is so vague a charge that we may be excused for doubting whether the writer himself knew ex-

actly what he did mean. It looks very like an expression of the feeling we are apt to indulge when things do not go well—a desire to find somebody to throw the blame on. There has certainly been room for reproach, but it does not seem to *us* to lie among loyal *women*. A gentleman from whom we might have expected something nobler, lately did his part towards giving currency to a report too vague to be fair, in the course of a speech, whose loyal fervor, arising in an unexpected quarter, called the attention as it received the plaudits of all good citizens, throughout the land. And we find in the written expression of a lady writer in the *Atlantic Monthly* of March, 1863, one whose sharp dicta are winged with such vehemence that they must doubtless sink deep in every mind within their reach, such words as these: "The women of to-day have not "come up to the level of to-day. They do not stand abreast with "its issues. They do not rise to the height of its great argu- "ment. I have beheld, O Dorcasses! with admiration and grati- "tude, the coats and garments, the lint and bandages which "you have made. Tender hearts, if you could have finished "the war with your needles, it would have been finished long "ago; but stitching does not crush rebellion, does not annihi- "late treason, or hew traitors in pieces before the Lord. * * * "The war cannot be finished by sheets and pillow-cases. Some- "times I am tempted to believe that it cannot be finished till "we have flung them all away." And so on, through a very animated address, which we should all read and ponder, for we have much to learn. But the image which rises spontaneously in the mind as we read the exhortations to loyal women, is that of "Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite," a loyal woman of old, whose "soul of fire," "burning white and strong and steady," enabled her with her own hand to drive a nail through and through the temples of her sleeping enemy-guest, so as to pin him to the ground in her tent, to which she had tempted him by the offer of much-needed refreshment. "At her feet he bowed, he fell, he lay down; where he bowed, there he fell down dead. The mother of Sisera looked out at a window, and cried through the lattice, Why is his chariot so long in coming?" * This is a heroine quite after the Southern pattern,

* JUDGES, Chap. V.

if we may believe reports, but not one whose ferocious patriotism could ever become attractive to the women of the North. There is undoubtedly a radical difference between the women of the two sections. We knew it before there was a thought of war (on our part), and we have become still more thoroughly aware of it since.

> "That bright and fierce and fickle is the South,
> And dark and true and tender is the North."

The gist of all that has been said of our deficiency in the present crisis, so far as we understand it, is that we have not shown *passion* enough; that we have acted naturally, in short. Why should we simulate a "white heat" if we did not feel it, or see any occasion for it? The time may come when our patriotic fire will need no incitement; when the "sacred fury" will burn of itself, as alone it should burn. When it does, it will be no straw-blaze of excitement, calling the eyes of spectators and dying out easily, if not fed by new supplies of its vain fuel. Thus far we have seen only obvious duties and anxiously fulfilled them to the best of our ability. It is a solemn truth that notwithstanding all the outrages of our traitorous assailants, we have never yet been able to get personally angry with them. Not that we do not from our souls hate and despise traitors and treachery, but that the old habit of friendship with our Southern neighbors makes it so difficult for us to connect those feelings with them and make it personal.

It can hardly be expected that the great body of loyal women should quietly accept the derogatory comparison alluded to. They must be permitted indignantly to repel the charge of indifference, and to call upon those who originated and those who have echoed it, for some specifications. If it were only for the sake of our soldiers, far away and looking homeward, they must deny the impeachment. To leave their brave defenders, who have offered their lives a ransom for us at home, and who have a right to expect from us every service, every sympathy, every tender and devoted feeling that our souls are capable of, to leave *them* to believe that we tacitly confess a shameful delinquency, would be to forget what is due to ourselves and to them. Soldiers! you can speak for us. Have we been indifferent to your

wants and sufferings; have we chilled your noble devotion by our faint-hearted words; have our letters to you breathed a spirit of discontent and repining, or failed to hail your enthusiasm and give the full measure of praise and joy to your heroic achievements? You who have lately, in a time of need, spoken so nobly for your country and its government, to the confusion of blatant traitors, lift your voices once more, in behalf of the loyal women who await you at home! Say whether the tenderness which is our glory is of that fatal kind which unnerves its object, or of that nobler sort which makes his arm irresistible through the courage it inspires in his heart! Speak the truth of us as you know it, and we will accept it even though it rebuke and humble us!

The form of the accusation which touches us so nearly is that of a comparison between the women of the two parts of our country, as now divided or sought to be divided by the present bitter contest. No other measure is proposed for our duty than what the Southern women are supposed to have done. It would certainly be difficult to find proper and sufficient material for the implied contrast. Whoever set the idea afloat did not claim to have access to any extraordinary sources of information on either side, and must therefore be considered as having drawn his conclusion from what he, like others, had seen in the public prints,—the accounts of "regular" and "special" correspondents; anecdotes reported by casual observers; intercepted letters; and the stories of refugees or returned prisoners, as to the spirit and behavior of Southern women; while as to Northern women a good deal of pains should have been taken, by one who desired to judge and speak fairly, to discover what they were thinking and doing, since they are especially careful *not* to get into the newspapers, whether for good or evil. Public notice they consider not a reward, but a misfortune, and are ready, when it happens to them, to ask, "What wrong or foolish thing have I done?" But there is no evidence of any pains having been taken in the case, and therefore, even allowing that from public sources there might be drawn anything like a fair general idea of the spirit of Southern women, there does not appear, nor can there have existed, any grounds for conclusions worthy of respect as to the

sentiments or actions of those of the North. This statement will be acknowledged by those who know us, to be literally and exactly correct. We have made no public demonstrations. The Southern people are obviously more demonstrative than we, and it is natural for superficial observers to conclude that the side which makes the greatest display has felt most warmly and made the most effort and sacrifice. We could not imitate them, and should be contemptible if we tried. The feelings of Northern women are rather deep than violent; their sense of duty is a quiet and constant rather than a headlong or impetuous impulse. It would be impossible to persuade them that any parade of sentiment is not unbecoming or even ridiculous. Among us it is only the more shallow and evanescent feelings that seek the light. We never say much about our patriotism; we should as soon think of entertaining the world by protestations of affection for our parents or our children. We are willing and glad to live and labor for their sakes, even, if need were, to die for them, God giving us grace. But we should scarcely think of publishing this feeling of devotion, far less of priding ourselves on what we should blush not to feel. This settled aversion to show in matters of the heart, no doubt subjects Northern women to the imputation of coldness, but it is better to accept than to transgress the inborn sense of propriety which demands self-restraint.

Perhaps this habitual reserve or self-control is sometimes carried too far, as it may occasionally circumscribe their influence by lessening the sphere of their example. Instinct, education, and habit, all prompt them to err rather on that side than on the other. Passionate utterance is no evidence of right feeling; it is too often the mere ebullition of that which has no support in reason or principle. Yet passion in a noble cause may be both natural and useful, and it certainly becomes us to think whether our too-carefully restrained manner may not bring reproach upon our noble cause. We might at least extract so much good from the bitter things put forth against us, as the ancient Britons are said to have compounded healing medicines from the gall of their slain enemies.

After all, Christian women must be no boasters. When they have "done all," they are bound to feel themselves "unprofit-

able servants," and to seek no reward from the applause of man. During this war, how many such silent heroines have suffered and died among us! Who can tell how many lovely women—not hirelings, but belonging to rich and prosperous families—have sunk under their labors in our hospitals, or died of disease contracted there! Who knows their number, or has recorded for the public eye their service and suffering? There will come a time when we can sit down and reckon up the fearful loss brought upon us by the wild and cruel indulgence of unhallowed passions in those to whom passion seems better than reason. When that time comes, it will be due to the loved and lost that it shall be known how they lived, and why they died; and in the revelations of the hour it will become evident that under a calm and self-restrained exterior may be hidden a holy patriotic fire which consumes its tenement that it may give light and life to the suffering. Then, perhaps, some who rashly judge of love of country by the noise it makes may see cause to repent their hasty conclusions.

At first, before we learned what was the temper of the South, we did not anticipate any occasion for private and personal sacrifices. We did not even believe the possibility of war upon such grounds as were alleged. We fancied that good sense, justice, patriotism; the recollection of oft-repeated and recent oaths of unswerving allegiance; a feeling of brotherhood which would fain try every method of accommodation before resorting to the dread arbitrament of the sword,—that these and a thousand other elements of peace would be found powerful in averting a contest so fatal to our reputation as a nation, so discouraging to the friends of Liberty all over the world. Calm and confident in the sure knowledge that the Government under which we were all prosperous and happy had done nothing hostile to the interests of the Southern part of the great Republic, but had, in fact, been for years ruled by them for the benefit of their supposed interests, and having too much respect for the good sense and right feeling of the South to believe that the expression of private sentiment or even of public opinion,—free in all free countries,—against the institution of slavery, would be considered a sufficient reason for the murder of our husbands and our sons, we were slow to conceive the idea of

anything more than a mere political *fracas;* a little more virulent expression of one of those threats which we had long been in the habit of hearing, whenever the South had in any case failed in Congress to carry a point in favor of slavery.

There had been no thirty years preparation of treason on our side, and though men judged better of the stern necessity, women walked as in a dream, hoping against hope. When successive outrages had made the war first inevitable, then actual, present, and terrible; when the clang of arms and the blare of trumpets filled our streets, and parting with the head and life and support of our homes, left no further room for self-delusion, loyal women set about doing whatever was required to be done, without passion except of sorrow, without words or noise; calling upon nobody to notice or admire them; in no sense putting themselves forward, but waiting to be called upon by those immediately engaged in public affairs. Surrounded by Southern people and Northern sympathizers with the rebellion, daily hearing galling words and odious sentiments, which could not but be very trying to the true and loyal-hearted, and seeing actual rejoicing over the sorrows which unprovoked violence soon brought into Northern homes and hearts, there were no recriminations or attempts to foment the unhappy strife. The prevailing tone among women was that of grief; they had not the heart to attempt to increase the indignation of their husbands at unprovoked wrong, though they sustained them, as far as was in their power, in the determination to resist it. There was a frightful calm; a boding silence, more terrible, almost, than the thunders of war they presaged.

But the cannon of Sumter and the awful reverberation of Bull Run shook the land to its centre, and at once changed the calm into a tempest. It was then, and not till then, that loyal women understood perforce what was required of them. As one awakened from a deep sleep is slow to recognize in the light which fills his chamber, the baleful signal of ruin, conflagration, and death, yet being once fully roused, finds all his faculties called into instant activity by the emergency, so they, when the awful moment of full comprehension came, sought and discovered in themselves powers as yet unsuspected, and energy which in peace, happiness, and luxury, had never been

aroused to action New life came to many an enervated mind and body; the rust of long prosperity could not withstand the power of noble feeling; even the gay and thoughtless votary of fashion hailed the new pleasure,—that of being disinterestedly, generously useful,—and proved how terrible is the waste of power going on in ordinary times within that golden circle. But even now what was said and done was of that quiet and unobtrusive kind that carries with it no suspicion of a hankering after observation and praise. There was nothing theatrical, nothing flaunting. The Northern daughter of the Republic might have said with Cordelia—

> "Unhappy that I am, I cannot heave
> My heart into my mouth."

There was no speech or boast or threat of any Northern women recorded, so far as we know. Those heavy brown linen aprons, which came into vogue just then, were not like the stage disguises put on for effect, and from which the wearer is but to emerge more splendid than ever. They meant *work*,—hard, unpleasant, unshrinking work. Those who wore them went into great packing-rooms, to spend the long summer days and weeks in assorting and preparing for use the countless thousands of garments and delicacies which the women of every State and town and hamlet were busy in preparing for the soldiers, or into the streets gathering money from door to door by the most painful of all processes, or into the hospitals, already overflowing with patients, to tend all sufferers alike, without a question or a thought whether rebel gray or loyal blue had clad the pale victim while he wore the garb of health and strength, dressing loathsome wounds, watching at the bedsides of camp fevers, cheering the faint-hearted, lifting up the trembling soul just parting from all on earth, and agonized at the thought of dear ones far away; physicians of all souls, practising under the license of a great love and pity, feeling that every man who needs help is a brother, though his rash hand may have been lifted against his country and shed her dearest blood. These days and nights of untiring mercy,—which we should not speak of as past, for they are as full of love and service at this moment as ever,—have made no noise in the world. The good and no-

ble deeds they have witnessed never reach the newspapers, unless as, ever and anon, some fair and lovely ministrant sinks into the early grave from which she had saved many a son of Southern as well as Northern mother, her name and fate may fill a line of print, to let her distant friends and lovers know why she so suddenly faded in her bloom, to pass away and be seen no more on earth forever. In this, "we speak that we do know and testify that we have seen," and to the eye of Memory, dear and precious and beautiful forms rise up unbidden witnesses of the truth of what has here been said.

As we observed at the outset, there is no satisfactory amount of material for the proposed comparison, and we can but use what we have, confessing its insufficiency. The task of collecting and exhibiting the manifestations of Southern female feeling, as it has come to us in the newspapers of both sections, in innumerable intercepted letters, and in the reports of returned prisoners, would not be a gracious one. To perform it thoroughly, giving facts and data, would require an amount of enmity towards our "wayward sisters" which it is to be hoped few of us entertain. It is difficult, even, to believe in the reality of such hatred as they profess. The excuse of "fiery blood," "tropical imaginations," and other peculiarities rather boasted of by natives of the "Sunny South," does not cover a violence and brutality of tone, which has not, so far as we know, its parallel in the history, even of the most terrible wars of modern times, unless the sayings and doings of the "Dames de la Halle,"—those terrible Parisian fish-women—in the darkest days of the French Revolution, may furnish a precedent. But those wretched *poissardes* had at least the apology of horrible oppression, while the venom of their modern imitators is self-grown and causeless. In the old Scandinavian mythology, we read of mythic heroes, at their Valhalla banquets, drinking blood from the skulls of their enemies; but even there, no *woman* is found partaking of the horrid feast, or preparing the skulls required for these detestable orgies, or decorating her person with ornaments made from human bones. This species of patriotism would not, even in barbarous times, have been considered appropriate in our sex, for mankind have from the beginning, unanimously required in women the kind and

loving ministrations which the warrior and the man of peace equally find precious and sustaining. Fierce and passionate women may claim a dreary splendor, but unless "the rage of the vulture" is tempered by the "love of the turtle," no man prays that their number may increase. Many a Southern woman, during this war, has written to husband, brother, or lover, to bring home with him "a dead Yankee, pickled," or "a hand, or an ear, or a thumb, at least," if he expected to be well received at his return. Letters of this tenor are extant, and have been not unfrequently exhibited among the spoils of Southern camps, and the various trophies of our victories on Southern soil. Melancholy victories! not only as being won in civil war, but as bringing to our knowledge traits of character, and evidence of malignant feeling, whose existence in our country and in female bosoms, we should otherwise never have suspected.

We must by no means ascribe these sad exhibitions altogether to a peculiar sectional ferocity. Human nature has a bad side, and no one nation or people can justly be considered worse at heart than all others. The practice of Slavery, with the unsexing and degrading scenes belonging to it, familiarity with the sound of the lash, and the sight of the blood it draws from human flesh, with cries of anguish and prayers for mercy, answered only by derision; the habit of living on the unrequited earnings of a crushed and despoiled people, too weak to plead their own cause before the world, and appealing to every generous, every human feeling, but in vain! These form, doubtless, the leading reasons for the wide difference observable between that character of low-bred women, North and South.

Then, too, the ignorance which is the misfortune of the inferior whites of the South, may properly be counted an apology for some lack of self-control and some passionate rudeness. An ignorance so gross as to despise instruction, must, when it is the heritage left by mother to daughter, for successive generations, leave the soul the unresisting prey of degrading passions; and when the weaker part of a scattered population, like that of the South, has been persuaded by designing rulers to glory in such ignorance, the climax of unrea-

son is reached. There may be virtues left, but manners must touch the lowest point which leaves social intercoure possible.

It is conceded, and can need no proof, that the patriotic feelings of our Northern women have never betrayed them into any violence of action or expression, even in moments of the greatest excitement. They have never been nerved by a feeling of deadly hatred. They have not tried the force of hideous grins, or insulting gestures, or unspeakable outrages on the nerves of blushing soldiers. No man in arms against the United States, since the April of Sumter, can testify that he ever saw or heard in a loyal woman of these States, a look or word unbecoming her sex. No woman within our borders, however low in the social scale, unless belonging to the unhappy class which is not nor can be loyal to God or man, to sex or nation, has brought reproach upon her country, or furnished matter of triumph to the enemy, by mistaking ferocity or vulgarity for patriotism. It is not in the nature of the true American woman to make such mistakes. She would rather crush back into her heart even the noble passion which rises naturally at the sight of those who are doing us unprovoked and cruel wrong, than risk being for a moment confounded with a class of females to whom violence is natural and insolence spontaneous. According to our Northern creed, when a woman ceases to be a woman, she becomes nothing, or worse than nothing.

Far be it ever from us to cast, even by remotest implication, the reproach due to brazen brows upon the great body of Southern women now unhappily looking upon us, their Northern sisters, as enemies. Who does not know their worth, their domestic virtues, their lady-like delicacy, their feminine grace? Where shall we look for better wives and mothers, or more devoted Christians, tried, as they often are, in ways of which Northern women can form but little idea? No Northern woman would claim for herself a character purer or more dignified, more moderate in prosperity, more patient under affliction, than that which she freely accords to Southern women of her acquaintance. It is hardly probable that any of us here ever beheld the face of one of the hideous termagants who have done their best to bring disgrace upon all the women

of the fair Southern land. In times of war and commotion, bad women, like bad men, find an opportunity of coming to the surface, and they eagerly seize the chance which thus presents itself. This is natural and unavoidable; the only strange thing about it is, that beings like these should have been by any one supposed to be fair specimens of the women of the South, and that attrocities, which were the fruit of unreasoning hate, should have been counted as virtues, and indirectly recommended to loyal women for imitation!

The devotion of many women of high character to the bad cause of Secession, we are bound to believe sincere and ardent. That there are many such who secretly mourn over the suicidal course in which their husbands and friends are involved, we *know;* but even where they disapprove most, we may be sure they find place for woman's work—the care of the sick and wounded, the relief of the poor, and all the ceaseless, nameless good deeds, in their power, all the love-taught expedients, of which the sex is capable, to ameliorate some of the evils consequent upon the great wrong. Besides these, there are many who, having been bred and matured in the "State sovereignty" heresy—the feeling and belief that to the citizen the State is and should be a higher power than the Nation—go hand in hand with husbands, sons, and brothers in rebellion, and devote their best efforts to what they have learned to believe a righteous cause. And this is the occasion of no unwomanly display on their part. They may talk as Southern women are apt to do somewhat floridly of Southern "Chivalry," and Northen meanness, judged after their standard, but they will not parade their unreasoning patriotism in the newspapers, or in their zeal forget their womanhood.

We can know little of the conduct of the women belonging to Union families at the South, or of their interest and part in the war, until they are once more restored to their rights. Up to the present moment, the armed heel of a cruel despotism is upon them; their husbands and friends live with the sword suspended over their heads by the single hair, not of justice but of arbitrary power, and seclusion and quiet are their only safety. Whether they have been able to accomplish any thing for their country beyond the present sacrifice of all earthly

good to high and noble principles, we are not permitted to inquire, but we may humbly hope that their trials are noted, and their great sacrifice recorded in the Book of Life. Surely "their prayers and their alms are come up for a memorial before God," and He has sustained them under all their afflictions. May our suffering sisters look up and say, "In the shadow of thy wings will I make my refuge, until these calamities be overpast." There is good hope that the end of their trial is drawing nigh, and that their faithfulness will ere long be crowned with rejoicing.

Setting aside all rude and personally disgusting modes of exhibiting what is intended to pass as patriotism, and with them the loud and offensive boasting which used to meet the ears of all who travelled by public conveyance in the early part of the war, before such treasonous interruptions of the public peace were put down by authority, let us look a little closer into the claim set up for the Southern women to a high-toned love of country. Considering, as before, the common newspapers, North and South, as the only authority attainable in the case, what do we find? Persons in the garb of ladies, remaining at the seat of government to play a double part, professing loyalty, and shrinking from no extent of falsehood which would enable them to betray the dearest interests of the country to which they vowed allegiance; taking advantage of their sex and position to do what would justly have condemned men to the "short shrift and strong cord," which in all countries is the doom of the spy, yet on detection, so devoid of honor and dignity as to make loud or whining complaints, as they happened to be more coarse or more weak, of the mere imprisonment by which our mildest of governments marked its sense of their misbehavior! We may be allowed to hope that few of the women of the North have not more fortitude, even in evil.

And what shall we say of women claiming a respectable position in society, at our seat of government again, going into the hospitals there, after the battle of Bull Run, to offer their services to secessionist prisoners, making their way to the bedsides of our suffering and dying men, our Union soldiers, to look with malignant pleasure upon their sufferings, saying, "You deserve it all! You ought to have been killed!" This

was zeal which we pray God may never be exhibited by loyal women, whatever the provocation of such conduct.

The poisoning of food and water for our soldiers, which must have been done by female connivance at least, is too black a crime to be attributed to any cause but the fiendish passions of a few individuals who would disgrace any country, though specimens of the class may, perhaps, be found in all. But we cannot help noticing that in no case which ever became known at the North was it reprehended by any Southern print, but passed by as a trifle—a thing of course, or something praiseworthy. If it be true, as moralists declare, that women in civilized countries powerfully influence the tone of public opinion, how did it happen that women who must have known, at least, of these atrocities, did not insist on their being disclaimed and branded with a public stigma?

And taking this influence for granted, what share of the inhuman cruelties practised at the South upon Union prisoners shall we ascribe to the women? If the Southern women have indeed "inspired" the men, what shall we think of such inspiration? It would be hard to convince us that if women had pleaded against the authorized cruelties at which common humanity shudders, those of our poor boys who escape alive from Southern bondage might have a different story to tell, and far less appalling marks of bodily suffering to show. The recital of what the people of Chicago, women as well as men, have done for the six thousand Southern prisoners at Camp Douglas—the food and medicines for the sick and convalescent, the clothing and comforts of every kind sent in by private benevolence, and gladly received and distributed by the officers in charge; the schools kept for those willing to learn; in short, the general desire that the poor creatures should be the better, not the worse, for having been thrown by the fortunes of war into our care—would be a tolerable answer to those who depreciate the good works of Northern women in this war, for none of this was done without the warm and efficient co-operation of women. The utter astonishment evinced by the recipients of such bounty confirms, if that were necessary, the stories of barbarous treatment reported by our returning soldiers, for it was contrast that brought simple benevolence into such strong relief.

Now, the patriotic feeling which prompts deception and falsehood, the poisoning of hungry men, the taunting of wounded and suffering ones, and the deliberate torture of prisoners of war, excite in us of Northern blood no envy, no emulation. We are willing the credit of it should remain with those to whom it belongs. It requires all our Christian charity to say, "Father, forgive them!"

A more agreeable topic would be the services performed by Southern women in behalf of their armies, and of all their poor who may be suffering on account of the war. Our data for this purpose are few and small. No doubt Southern women have nursed in hospitals, and made garments, and furnished many comforts for their soldiers, and this often when dearth of material rendered the service peculiarly difficult. But, adhering to the idea of a *comparison*, could any especial merit be claimed for such services as these? Have *only* Southern women been giving their time and thoughts, their means, strength, and ingenuity to the necessities of the hour? This will hardly be claimed. We may, perhaps, say, without boasting, that here we should be quite ready to be weighed in the balance with our Southern sisters. What they have done for the poor, we have not heard. We know that General Butler found the poor of New Orleans starving, surrounded by wealth and luxury, and that wherever the armies of the United States have occupied our Southern territory, their first care and duty have been to feed the perishing poor, abandoned to famine and nakedness by those for whom they had all their lives been toiling unpaid. What the women of the South could have done towards preventing this disgrace and cruelty, we do not know, but we *do* know that such things could never have happened among us, for our poor are a part of ourselves, and the care of them part of our religion.

There may have been large subscriptions raised in Southern cities, and working committees of ladies everywhere, as among us, who gave themselves up to the duty of seeking out and relieving the distresses of the suffering classes, especially of that most unhappy of all God's poor—the class who "possess no rights which white men are bound to respect," but who on that very account, besides the fact that they are so "fond of their

masters," and so "devoted" to them, should be tenderly cared for by white women. We hope there may have been such institutions and such exertions, but the accounts of them have not reached us. On the other hand, our Northern poor have only to show that he who was the support of the family has gone to the war, or died there, or come home disabled—to become the object of efficient public and private beneficence, and this to such an extent, that many of them are better housed, fed, and clothed than they ever were before. This state of things is so well known, that the favorite plea of the impostor who seeks charity fraudulently, is the absence or loss of husband or father in the army.

As to the "sacrifices" said to have been made by the women of the South, and which are insisted upon by their Northern sympathizers as proofs of heroic resolution, their merit must depend upon circumstances. It is no virtue to wear a coarse dress if you can obtain no other, or to live poorly when good living is too costly for your means. It is very probable that the sacrifices of the women have been greater than those of the men, if we exclude from the calculation the hardships which all soldiers in all wars must necessarily endure. But we cannot class such sacrifices with those voluntarily borne by our revolutionary mothers, for they suffered gladly in the cause of LIBERTY, while the women of the South have no higher incentive than the determination to uphold their husbands in the attempt to perpetuate SLAVERY. The sacrifices required by a war which the South voluntarily commenced should have been counted beforehand. A rebellion against just and lawful, kind and beneficent authority; a war which pretends to no high or holy motive, and can allege in its justification no public wrong or injury, can claim no general sympathy for the sufferings and sacrifices it compels a consenting people to bear, nor can sacrifices in a bad cause take the rank which belongs to those endured for a principle sanctioned alike by God and man. We know that women usually adopt the political views of their husbands, and we profess no surprise that Southern women should have done so. We see it among ourselves, and have felt it in the refusal of women whose husbands sympathize with the South to do anything for the country or the army in this

crisis, but we must regret that their sacrifices should not have been made in a more worthy cause, and hope for their own sakes that they will never glory in them. To suffer for liberty is glorious; to deprive ourselves of the comforts and necessaries of life in behalf of slavery, can never be anything but ignominious, though human sympathy views with pity the sufferings of those so desperately mistaken.

It is true that we of the North have seen as yet little occasion for these personal sacrifices which, doubtless, press heavily upon our belligerent neighbors. Our industry has known no interruption, and our prosperity has been ample, so far as material things are concerned. We weep for our losses by this cruel war, but not for any lack experienced in the ordinary comforts of our firesides. There is a vacant place at many a board, and the feast loses its savor when we think of the absent or the lost one; but if abundance, or even luxury, could content us, we should have little cause to lament the present state of things. If the time of dearth should come; if by some miraculous interference we should change positions with our Southern sisters, and be obliged to deny ourselves in order to help our country in the great struggle against oppression and threatened barbarism, let us hope we may be found equal to the time, and, of all things, preserved from boasting of any services it may be in our power to render. Now, and ever, what we give to the soldiers in field or hospital we give to our own souls, to our flesh and blood, to our beloved country; and if more be required, we are ready to give more, even to all that we possess. But we promise never to claim any merit for it.

We are told of Southern housewives cutting up their carpets to make blankets for their soldiers, and we can easily believe it; for many of our good country-women who never had a carpet in their lives, except of rags, have given the blankets off their own beds to *our* soldiers, and used pieces of rag-carpet in place of them. Beyond question, there is many a good Southern wife who has toiled day and night, and denied herself everything, that she might sustain and comfort her husband in the miserable business he has undertaken, and many a poor Union woman who has endured still severer sacrifices without the support of the remotest sympathy in the cause. But we see

in the Southern papers glowing accounts of the luxurious indulgences of the ladies of Richmond, side by side with paragraphs describing the fearful scarcity of provisions, and the deprivations of the poor. A few weeks ago the Richmond papers declared, with some show of natural indignation, that the army horses were starving, while certain gay people in the capital were pampering their useless steeds that the ladies might not lose their drives by moonlight! More recently we are told that three thousand women, of the classes that do *not* have many "drives by moonlight," have been driven by desperation to attack the shops where provisions and clothing are sold, in search of the necessaries of life for themselves and their families. Similar outbreaks occurred in less considerable places.

In the attempt to consider impartially the comparison forced upon us by circumstances, we sincerely deprecate the impression that loyal women desire to magnify their own patriotism, or to claim praise for anything which they have been able to do for the soldiers or their families. In truth, if any thing could induce a feeling of humility, it would be the review of what little it has been in our power to accomplish at a time like the present, when our country is shedding her best blood in a contest which involves her very existence. There are moments when we feel ashamed, almost, of living comfortably; of reading fresh and pleasant books or enjoying social gatherings; of giving our children and young people the indulgences common to their age; of letting our thoughts wander to a happy future, unmindful of what sorrow and suffering may lie between us and that perhaps distant time. We are but too sensible that while we are thus surrounded with comforts, hundreds of thousands of men are undergoing toil and hardships, privation and danger, that we and our children to remote generations may enjoy the blessings of peace and unity, under a free government—the achievement of our honored forefathers. We know that some of these are perishing in camps and battle-fields, in sea-storms or in poisonous bayous, or stretched helpless on hospital cots, lonely, sad, but resolute and devoted; thinking of home, longing for letters, wondering whether we really feel any warm interest in our defenders, or whether in our wealth, our pleasure, our luxury, and the interchange of happy domestic

affection that is worth all the rest, we forget those who have accepted the duty of dying for us if need be! Thoughts like these keep us humble enough, and we are sometimes forced, for mere consolation, to recall what we have done and are doing and mean to go on doing for these beloved ones, every one of whom, seen in the golden light shed around him by his patriotic devotion and the ever-impending danger which so ennobles and separates him from common life, appears at once a hero and a brother. Self-complacency is not the fault we are just now most prone to, yet to put ourselves right in the estimation of the army, we would risk the appearance of it.

Besides, it is to be observed that we advance no claim to *superiority* in zeal and devotedness, over the women of the South. It is to vindicate loyal women from a charge of *deficiency*, as compared with the other side, that we venture to speak. A charge lightly utterly and carelessly echoed may be keenly felt by those whose souls have been stirred to their inmost depths by the sublime impulses of the time. That American women—women whose mothers and grandmothers can remember Washington and the heroes and heroisms of the Revolution; women in whom love of country has always seemed so much a part of life, an impulse of nature, that they never thought of claiming it as a virtue; who have given their dearest blood to the war, followed their precious ones with anxious tendance and service, received them back maimed, broken, or coffined, yet never, even in their anguish, cried—"Submit to wrong, for why should we die!"—that *we* should be suspected of coldness, of selfish indifference, in this awful crisis; of a stupid want of interest in the great death-grapple of liberty with despotism; civilization with barbarism; of a love of ease and luxury powerful enough to unnerve our hands when they should be full of strength; of a willingness to renounce our birthright rather than our pleasures, and forfeit our great future sooner than relinquish the flowery path we have been treading—degenerate indeed must we be, unworthy alike of our sires and of our sons, if we deserved the insidious imputation. Our cheeks burn with shame and indignation at being obliged to repel it.

If we interpret aright the attempt to contrast us unfavorably

with Southern women in devotion to the public service, the meaning is that *they* have sustained their men in fiery hate and contempt for their countrymen of the North, and done everything possible to incite and encourage them in the determination to found an empire, whose corner-stone should be human slavery. They, having seen slavery, felt it, known its horrors, suffered under its attendant evils, and learned, so far as they have learned Christianity, its incompatibility with God's benign law of love, have deliberately lent themselves and those dearer than life to them, to the perpetuation of so awful an evil, for the sake of an idea, however futile, of worldly prosperity! The separation of families, the lashing of women, brutal tortures of young girls from the most atrocious motives—all these and long list of crimes and outrages upon humanity, of which these are but specimens, excite no repugnance, it seems, in the minds of Southern women? They are willing to go on and on, and to uphold the whole abomination just as it is, and the reward for which they submit to this fearful self-degradation is the pleasure of a triumph over the hated "Yankees!" Great God! what ideas must have taken root in such minds, and what sympathy with such feelings can be recommended to Northern wives and mothers! What but blind and unreasoning passion can be urged as an excuse for complicity with a sin that cries to Heaven? That slavery is the cause of the war; that our Northern disapprobation of slavery is the source of all the bitter hatred expressed against us; that the "spirit" of the Southern women who are held up as examples for us has the same origin—these are truths which are seen and known and acknowledged by all. It is indeed mortifying to find Northern minds attempting to incite in us a corresponding passionate hatred.

The women of the South, the great body of the respectable portion, excluding on the one hand those who laboriously imitate, though at a greater distance than they imagine, the aristocracy of older countries, and who, though themselves generally the nurslings of a despised race, yet pride themselves on a supposed purity of blood; and on the other, those "poor whites" who, in intelligence and morality, compare not too favorably with that despised race—exclusive of these two extremes, the

women of the South do not approve of slavery or desire its continuance. When they speak their honest sentiments, they tell their Northern friends that it is a greater curse to them and their children than even we suppose. Many a spontaneous and artless expression of this truth appears in their conversation and in their literature, scanty as it is. They have been instinctively and without design the exponents of that "morbid conscience of the South," which Mr. Mac Duffie, years ago, deprecated as threatening slavery most ominously. When they broughr their sons and their daughters to the North to be educated, they often told us why! These women we do not hear from in these dark days. What has become of their abhorrence of slavery and its poisonous consequences? We are told of the sacrifices they have made in the cause of War—have they ever made a sacrifice in the cause of Truth? If all the women in the rebellious States who disapprove of slavery, and believe it to be an evil and a sin, had, as with one voice, remonstrated against this war for its extension and perpetuity, instead of weakly allowing passion to influence them, without regard to principle or conscience, there would have been no war. If every Southern wife had done her whole duty by her husband, using the "still, small voice" to which God has given such power, in persuading him to listen to reason and duty, rather than to the trumpet-blare of a wicked and heartless ambition, what misery might have been saved! But not only failing to prevent, she has, so we are told, used all her power, and most successfully, to add fuel to the cruel flame, and to stifle, as far as possible, the whisper of conscience, which might at some happy moment have become audible.

Loyal sisters of the North, be not cast down by the hasty sentence which some, who thoughtlessly exalt passion above principle, have passed upon you. Listen to every good suggestion, but do not learn to be ashamed of having tried to do your whole duty instead of talking about it; and, above all, never be persuaded to regret that you have not stimulated the angry passions of your countrymen, whose high and holy cause is incitement enough for all brave and true hearts. If you have not been as vehement in expression as your Southern sisters, do not fancy it necessary or becoming to adopt their tone. You

are at least able to "give a reason for the faith that is in you," and it is a reason which you will never be ashamed to bring before the world, since God sanctions it, and mankind everywhere, except in the rebel States, holds it noble and worthy. The saying which has stung you so keenly, may be only the spear-point of a heavenly messenger inciting you to a warmer devotion, a more thorough consecration of yourselves and all that you possess to the great service of your country. At least, accept it thankfully as such. Who can do enough for such a country? Perhaps greater dangers than any we have yet encountered await us, and we are about to need a new energy. Our opponents are Americans, and we know what that means. Look at the recent tremendous contest at Charleston. Human power and skill in the dread enginery of war, and human courage and bravery could go no further, and the whole civilized world looks on with breathless interest. We can but dimly guess what is before us. If we, as women, can devise new duties for ourselves, if we can find new channels of help, new inspiration for good, new modes of evincing our love of country without public demonstration, let us not shrink, but rejoice. The shades of our brave old grandmothers, who could run bullets and load guns for their husbands, and who marched in procession to bury their tea-cups, when principle forbade the use of them, will not frown upon us, be our efforts ever so humble. And it may be that some among us who, seeing no present distress, have never yet fairly awakened to the full perception of the requirements and privileges of the hour, will, for the honor of the sisterhood, now come forward, and, being fresh in the work, press on beyond the foremost. We are all needed, and we must not hold back, supposing the work to grow less pressing. The spring budding around us, reminds us that the time of comparative inaction in our armies is over, and that our boys will soon be in want of everything we can do for them. Let us abridge our luxuries for their sakes; let us give them of our leisure; let us consecrate a large portion of our thoughts to them; let us write them innumerable letters of hope, and love, and cheer, full of sweet home chat and bright visions of the future, when their toil shall be over and the victory won. Let us pledge ourselves to treat with a true disdain every insidious

attempt at corrupting public feeling at the North; every man who is engaged in fomenting those miserable party divisions which form the last hope of our traitorous enemies It is already the fashion among the brave, high-spirited Western girls, to scorn and reject the coward who eludes the draft; let the mode spread among all classes. It is better than any Paris fashion the spring ships may bring over the sea. When those *fainéants* return, who have skulked to Canada and Nova Scotia to cheat their country out of the only service they were ever likely to render—that of stopping a bullet which might otherwise have reached a better man—let them meet the reception they deserve. We need not make faces at them, or send them presents of female or infants' gear, for that would be imitating the Southern women. But we can let them severely alone, forever. Let us be on the alert, that nothing possible to be done for our soldiers, our over-tasked government, our politically-blinded friends, or our whole beloved country, shall be left undone.

☞ *Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No.* 863 *Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.*

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 11.

NO FAILURE FOR THE NORTH.

From the "Atlantic Monthly."

We have reached a point in the history of our national troubles where it seems desirable to examine our present position, and to consider whether we ought to surrender ourselves to despair, or congratulate ourselves on decided success—whether we should abandon all attempts to restore the Union, assert the dignity of the Constitution, and punish treason, or nerve ourselves to new effort, and determine to persevere in a righteous cause so long as a single able-bodied man remains, or a dollar of available property is unexpended.

It may be, it must be, conceded that we commenced the contest with very crude and inadequate notions of what war really is. We proposed to decide the issue by appealing to the census and the tax-list—tribunals naturally enough occurring to a mercantile and manufacturing community—but how if the enemy prefer cannon and cold steel? Our first campaign was in the field of statistics, and we found the results highly satisfactory. Our great numerical superiority, aided by our immense material resources, gave us an early and an easy victory. We outnumbered the enemy everywhere, defeated them in every pitched battle, starved them by a vigilant blockade, secured meanwhile the sympathy and support of the whole civilized world by the holiness of our cause, and commanded its respect by the display of our material power and our military capacity—and in a few short months crushed the rebellion, restored the Union, vindicated the Constitution, hung the arch-traitors, and saw peace in all our borders. This was our campaign—on

paper. But war is something more than a sum in arithmetic. A campaign cannot be decided by the rule of three. No finite power can control every contingency, and have all the chances in its favor.

War means alternate success and defeat, alternate hope and disappointment, great suffering in the field, many vacant chairs at many firesides, immense expenditures with little apparent result, "the best-laid schemes foiled by a thousand unexpected contingencies, lamentable indecision in the cabinet, glaring blunders in the field, stagnation of industry, and heavy taxation.

> "War is a game, which, were the nations wise,
> Kings would not play at."

But nations are not always wise, and war often becomes a necessity. When, then, the necessity arises, it should be met manfully. The question once deliberately decided that peace is no longer consistent with national honor or national safety, the dread alternative must be accepted with all its hazards and all its horrors. To organize only in anticipation of certain and speedy success, to despise and underrate the enemy, to inquire with how small an army and how limited an expenditure the war can be carried on, is as unstatesmanlike as it is in flat defiance of all historical teaching. But if we carry our folly still farther in the same direction; if we fail to take into grave account the most obvious and inevitable incidents of actual warfare; if in our overweening confidence we neglect discipline, underrate the prime importance of promptness and decision in action, certainty and celerity in movement, and energy and activity in pursuit; if, in a word, we expect that the defences of the enemy are to fall into our hands by means as unwarlike as those that decided the fate of Jericho, or dream that because our cause is just every precedent in history, and every principle in human nature will be overruled in our favor—then we deserve to be outgeneralled, and are fortunate, if we escape final and disastrous defeat.

Now, has not this been precisely our cardinal and capital error, and are we not to-day suffering its natural consequences? To the blind and unreasoning confidence with which we began this war has succeeded a reaction running into the very opposite

extreme. We are given over to a despondency quite as unwarrantable as the extravagance of our early hopes. We demanded and expected impossibilities. Forgetting that the age of miracles has passed, many are now bitterly complaining that nothing has been accomplished, and predicting that all future efforts will terminate in similar failure. Two years have not elapsed since the first gun was fired at Fort Sumter; and yet we are amazed and mortified that our forces have not overrun the whole South, that victory has not crowned our arms in every battle, and that our flag does not float triumphant over every acre of every State once called Confederate. Whether this most desirable result could have been accomplished, if this or that policy had been adopted at the outset, is one of those problems that will never be solved; nor is the inquiry at present pertinent or profitable. Let us rather ask whether, in view of the means actually employed, our discontent with the existing condition of affairs is not unmanly and unreasonable. We are to measure results, not by the efforts that we ought to have put forth, nor by those which we should put forth, if, with our dear-bought experience, we were called upon once more to undertake such a gigantic enterprise. We must recall the aspect of affairs when we first embarked on this perilous sea. We must remember how ignorant we were of all the danger before us, how imperfect was the chart by which our course was to be determined, how many shoals and sunken rocks and cross-currents we were to encounter, as yet unknown to any pilot on board our noble ship of state, how little we knew of navigation in such angry waters, under so stormy a sky.

Turn back the pages of history for two short years, and dwell a moment on the picture presented to our eyes. A nation, enjoying to the utmost the substantial benefits belonging to fifty years of profound peace and unexampled prosperity; enervated by those habits of luxury which wealth easily accumulated always fosters, with a standing army hardly large enough to protect our Western frontier from the incursions of hostile Indians, and a navy ludicrously small in proportion to the extent of our sea-coast and the value of our commerce, is suddenly plunged into a war covering such an extent of territory, and calling for such an array of power by sea and land as to dwarf

into insignificance all modern wars, hardly excepting the military operations of Napoleon I.

And it must be remembered that education and habit had trained us to an implicit reliance on the sufficiency of our laws and the competency of our Constitution to meet and decide every issue that could possibly be presented. We could conceive of no public wrongs which could not be redressed by an appeal to the ballot-box, and of no private injuries for which our statutes did not provide a suitable remedy.

We were not only a law-abiding, but a peace-loving people. The report of the revolver was not heard in our streets, nor was the glitter of the bowie-knife seen in our bar-room. We deprecated mob-violence, and disliked the summary proceedings of Judge Lynch. We took no pains to conceal our horror of unnecessary bloodshed, and shared the views of civilized Christendom about duelling. We still clung to our plebeian prejudices against lawless violence, and persisted in believing that a swaggering bully could not be an ornament to cultivated and refined society. In fact, some excellent individuals at the North went so far as to seek to disseminate these old-fashioned notions among their Southern brethren, and made annual subscriptions to what was known (alas, that we must use the historic tense!) as the "Southern Aid Society," having for its praiseworthy object the support of ministers who should preach the gospel to our ardent and impulsive neighbors. What a sad and significant commentary is it upon the ingratitude of depraved human nature, that the condescending clergyman who whilom consented to collect the offerings of these discriminating philanthropists is now a chaplain in the Confederate army, and is invoking the most signal judgments of Heaven upon his former friends and fellow-laborers!

This, then, was our condition, and these were our habits, when we were rudely awakened from our dreams of peace by the roar of cannon and the clash of arms. What wonder that the startling summons found us all unready for such a crisis? What wonder that our early preparations to confront the issue thus forced upon us without note of warning were hasty, incomplete, and quite inadequate to the emergency? Is it discreditable to us that we were slow to appreciate the bitterness and intensity of

that hatred, which, long smouldering under the surface of Southern society, burst forth at once into a wide-spread conflagration, severing like flax all the ties of kindred, and all the bonds of individual friendship and national intercourse which had united us for half a century? Here was a section of our Union which had always enjoyed equal rights with us under the Constitution, and had known the Government only by its blessings,—nay, more, had actually, by the confession of its own statesmen, controlled the internal administration and dictated the foreign policy of the country since the adoption of the Constitution; which had no substantial grievance to complain of, and no fanciful injury which could not be readily redressed by legal and constitutional methods. Are we to be blamed because we could not easily bring ourselves to believe that an integral part of our nation, with such a history, could, under a pretence so bald as to insult the common sense of Christendom, rush headlong into a war which must close all its avenues of commerce, paralyze all its industry, threaten the existence of its cherished and peculiar institution,—in a word, whether successful or unsuccessful, inevitably result in its political suicide? At this very moment, accustomed as we have been for many sad and weary months to the daily development of Southern folly and madness, it is difficult, when we withdraw our minds from the present, to realize that the whole war is not a hideous nightmare.

In view of all this, I ask, is it strange that we did not at once comprehend all our danger, and did not enter the field with all our forces,—determined to fight with desperate energy until every trace of rebellion was crushed out? If, disturbed at midnight by footsteps in your chamber, you start up from sound slumber to see a truculent-looking vagabond prowling about your room with a lighted candle, do you not at once spring to your feet, collar the intruder, and shout lustily for help, if he prove too strong for you? Prompt and vigorovs action in such a case is simply the impulse of instinct. But how if you recognize in the untimely visitor a member of your own household? Will you seize and overpower him without asking a single question, or waiting for a word of explanation? Will you not pause for some overt act of hostility, some convincing proof of a fell

purpose? Suppose it transpire that he really means mischief, and you lose an important advantage by your delay to strike. You may regret the result; but does it in the least tend to show that you were cowardly or careless? Now, was not this our exact dilemma? Although the orgin of the war and the circumstances attendant upon its commencement are a thrice-told tale, are we not in danger of overlooking their bearing upon all our subsequent action? And shall we not act wisely, if we recur to them again and again, during this momentous contest?

But, asks a timid Conservative,—from whose patient button the fingers of an ardent apostle of peace have recently and most reluctantly parted,—has not this war been shamefully mismanaged by the Administration? have not contractors grown rich while soldiers have suffered? have not incompetent generals been unjustly advanced, and skillful commanders been summarily shelved? have we gained any advantages at all commensurate with our loss of blood and our expenditure of money? would not a cessation of hostilities on any terms be better than such a war as we are now waging? If we might venture to suggest a word of caution to our desponding friend, before attempting a reply to his broadside of questions, we would say: Beware how you indulge in too much conversation with a certain class of our citizens, whose hearty loyalty has been more than doubted, and whose conversion to the beauties of peace and the horrors of war is so sudden as to be very suspicious. Examine their antecedents, and you will find, that, when "border ruffians" in Kansas threatened with fire and sword the inoffensive emigrants from New England, these gentlemen saw nothing unusual in such proceedings, and answered all remonstrances with ridicule. Put them to the question to-day, and it will appear, that, from the very beginning of the struggle, all their sympathies have been with the South. They will tell you that Northern Abolitionists are alone responsible for the war; that the secession of the Southern States may have been unwise, but was not unreasonable; that they have always condemned coercion and advocated compromise; and that there is no safe and satisfactory way out of our existing difficulties but—*peace*. What do they mean by peace? Such peace as the highwayman, armed to the

teeth, offers to the belated traveller! Such peace as Benedict Arnold sought to negotiate with the English general! They know that the South will accept no terms but the acknowledgment of her independence, or the abject and unconditional submission of the Free States. They reject the first alternative, because they dare not go before the North on such an issue. Disguise it as they may, they are willing to adopt the second. The party to which, without an exception, these men belong, is powerless without the co-operation of the South, and would consider no sacrifice of principle too great, and no humiliation of the North too degrading, if it promised the restoration of their political supremacy. Avoid all such men. Distrust their advice. That way dishonor lies, and national disgrace. If you are not "armed so strong in honesty" as to be proof against such treasonable talk, you will soon be aware of a softening of your backbone, and a lamentable loss of earnest, active patriotism. Take counsel rather of your own common sense. Looking at the question in its narrowest and most selfish bearings, you *know* that we can neither recede nor stand still. Submission is slavery. Disunion paves the way for endless secession, and eternal warfare between rising and rival republics.

But there are other symptoms of disloyalty besides this persistent demand for peace. There are indications of a desire to array sections of the North against each other, and—Heaven save the mark!—by the very politicians who have been most bitter in their denunciation of "geographical parties." Here comes a little Western lawyer, with unlimited resources of slang and slender capital of ideas, barely redeemed from being an absolute blackguard by the humanizing influences of a New England college, but showing fewer and fewer symptoms of civilization as he forgets the lessons of his collegiate life; and *he* delights an audience of New York "roughs" by the novel information, that "Puritanism is a reptile" and the cause of all our troubles, and that we shall never fulfil our national destiny until Puritanism has been crushed. Let us not elevate this nauseating nonsense into importance by attempting a reply. Such men must be left to follow out their inevitable instincts. They are not worth the trouble necessary to civilize them. Mr. Rarey succeeded in taming a zebra from the London Zoölogical

Gardens; but a single lesson could not permanently reclaim the beast, and it soon relapsed into its native and normal ferocity. One experiment sufficed to show the power of the artist; no possible increase of value in the educated animal would have justified a prolonged and perfect training.

You ask if we have gained any advantages commensurate with our efforts, or with the high-sounding phrase of our declared purpose. Let us look at this a moment. Suppose we begin with a glance at the other side of the picture. Has all the boasting, have all the promises, been on the Federal side? Did we hear nothing of the Confederate flag floating over Faneuil Hall?—nothing of Washington falling into the hands of the enemy?—nothing of a festive winter in Philadelphia, and a general distribution of spoils in New York?—nothing of foreign intervention?—nothing of the cowardice of Northern Mudsills, and the omnipotence of King Cotton? Decidedly, the rebels began with a sufficiently startling programme. Let us see how far they have carried it out. As they were clearly the assailants, we have an undoubted right to ask what they have accomplished *aggressively.* We say, then, that, excepting in the case of one brief raid, the soil of a single Free State has never been polluted by the hostile tread of an invading force; that every battle-field has been within the limits of States claimed as Confederate; that while the war has desolated whole States represented in the Confederate Congress, not an acre north of Mason and Dixon's line has suffered from the ravages of the rebel armies. Was ever another scorpion more completely surrounded and shut in by a cordon of fire?

This is surely something, but it is by no means all. Have *we* accomplished nothing aggressively? We will call into court a witness from the enemy's camp. Hear the recent testimony of a leading journal, published in the Confederate capital:*

"It is not altogether an empty boast on the part of the Yankees, that they hold all that they have ever held, and that another year or two of such progress as they have already made will find them masters of the Southern Confederacy. They who think independence is to achieved by brilliant but inconsequential victories, would do well to look at the magni-

* *Richmond Examiner*, January 20th, 1863.

tude of Yankee possessions in our country. Maryland, Kentucky, and Missouri are claimed as constituent parts of the Confederation: they are as much in the power of Lincoln as Maine and Minnesota. The pledge once deemed foolish by the South, that he would 'hold, occupy, and possess' all the forts belonging to the United States Government, has been redeemed almost to the letter by Lincoln. Forts Pickens [Sumter?] and Morgan we still retain; but with these exceptions, all the strongholds on the seaboard, from Fortress Monroe to the Rio Grande, are in the hands of the enemy. Very consoling and very easy to say that it was impossible to prevent all this, and that the occupation of the outer edge of the Republic amounts to nothing. Drury's Bluff and Vicksburg give the lie to the first assertion; and the onward movement of Rosecrans towards Alabama, the presence of Grant in North Mississippi and of Curtis in Middle Arkansas, to say nothing of Banks at New Orleans and Baton Rouge, set at rest the silly dream that a thin strip of sea-coast only is in possession of our foes. The truth is, the Yankees are in great force in the very heart of the Confederacy; they swarm on all our borders; they threaten every important city yet belonging to us; and nearly two hundred thousand of them are within two days' march of the Confederate capital. This is no fiction. It is a fact so positive that no one can deny it."

But this reluctant recital by no means exhausts the record of our success. We have put into the field a volunteer force, fully armed and equipped, which, whether we consider its magnitude, the rapidity with which it has been raised, its fighting qualities, its patient endurance of unaccustomed hardships, or its intelligent appreciation of the principles involved in the contest, is without a counterpart in history. And yet more, from the invention and achievements of our iron-clads dates a new era in naval warfare, while in the value and variety of our ordnance we have taken the lead of all civilized nations. Can you find in all this nothing to quicken the pulse of your patriotism? Is here no ground for encouragement, no incitement to renewed effort?

But you complain of corruption among contractors, and of knavery among politicians. Will you point me to a single

war, ever waged on the face of the earth, where all the rulers were above reproach and all their subordinates unselfish? But what will you do about it? Grant that many contractors have made dishonest fortunes out of the calamities of their country, and that there are office-holders with whom "Stand by the Constitution?" means, Stand by the public crib from which we are richly and regularly fed, and "Uphold the Administration!" should be translated, Give us our full four years' enjoyment of the loaves and fishes. What then? Shall a few worthless straws here, and a few heaps of offal there, arrest or check the onward march of a mighty army, the steady progression of a great principle? Away with such trumpery considerations! Punish with the utmost severity of the law every public plunderer whose crimes can be dragged into the light of day; send to the Coventry of universal contempt every lagging and lukewarm official; but, in the name of all that is holy in purpose and noble in action, *move on!* To hesitate is worse than folly; to delay is more than madness. The salvation of our country trembles in the balance. The fate of free institutions for—who shall say how long?—may hang upon the issue of the struggle.

Your catalogue of grievances, however, is still incomplete. You are dissatisfied with our generalship as displayed in the field, and with the wisdom of our policy as developed by the cabinet. Unquestionably you have a constitutional right to grumble to your heart's content; but are you not aware that such complaints are as old as the history of the human race? Do you believe this to be the first war that was ever mismanaged, and that our undoubted blunders are either novel or peculiar to Republics? There never was a greater mistake. If there were brave men before Agamemnon, and wise counsellors before Ulysses, there certainly have been incompetent commanders before Mager-General A., and shallow statesmen before Secretary B. We do not monopolize executive imbecility, nor are our military blunders without parallel or precedent. To attribute our occasional reverses, and our indecisive victories, our inaction in the field and our confusion in the cabinet, to our peculiar form of government, is as inconsequential as it would be to trace all our disasters to the color of President Lincoln's hair or the number of General Halleck's children.

The enemies of free institutions, hardly yet recovered from their astonishment at beholding an army of volunteers, superior in number and quality to any the world ever saw, spring into existence with such marvellous rapidity as to eclipse, in sober fact, the fabulous birth of Minerva full-armed from the head of Jove, or their still greater surprise at seeing the immense expenses of so gigantic a war readily met without assistance from abroad, by large loans cheerfully made and heavy taxation patiently borne, are reduced to the necessity of exulting over what they term our "total want of military genius," and our "incapacity to conduct a campaign successfully."

It is useless to deny that we may have challenged criticism and provoked a smile by our large promise and our smaller performance. But are we the sole and exclusive proprietors of this experience? Where in the past or the present shall we find a great and powerful nation much addicted to modesty or self-depreciation? Least of all, should we have expected such venomous criticism and such unsparing ridicule from England. To be sure, we have long since ceased to look for sympathy or even justice at her hands. We have come to understand and appreciate the tone and temper of her ruling classes towards this country. In addition to their inherited antipathy to Republics, they believe in sober earnest what one of their greatest wits said jocosely, that "the great object for which the Anglo-Saxon race appears to have been created is the making of calico." And whatever interferes, or threatens to interfere, with this ennobling occupation is sure to incur their passive displeasure, if not their active hostility. We expect nothing, therefore, from their good-will; but we have a right to demand, as a matter of good taste, that, in criticizing our campaigns, they shall not wholly ignore their own military blunders, especially those so recent as to be fresh in the recollection of every third-form school-boy in the kingdom. For, if campaigns carried on with the smallest possible result in proportion to the magnitude of the sacrifice of money and life—if a succession of incompetent generals in command—if critical military opportunities neglected and enormous stragetic blunders committed—if indecision, nepotism, and red tape at home, envy, want of unity, and incapacity among officers, and unnecessary and inexcusable hardship

among the privates—if all this declares the decadence of a Government, then was the sun of England hastening to its setting during the Crimean War.

We hear much said abroad about our indecisive battles, our barren victories, our failure to take advantage of the crippled condition of a defeated enemy, and our unaccountable disinclination to follow up a successful attack by a prompt pursuit. Now, not for the sake of excusing or palliating the numerous and grave errors into which we have fallen during our own unhappy struggle, nor yet to exonerate from censure any civil officers or military leaders who may be wholly or in part responsible for these errors, but simply to demonstrate that they are liable to occur under any form of government, and, indeed, have recently befallen the very government whose rulers now hold us to the strictest account, and are most eager to convict us of extraordinary misconduct and incapacity, we propose, very briefly, and without further introduction, to examine the record of the English army during the Crimean War.

The first important battle fought on the Peninsula was that of the Alma. We will give, as consisely as possible, so much of the history of this engagement, compiled from authentic English sources, as will present a correct picture of the plans formed and the results accomplished.

"The 15th of August, 1854, was the first date fixed for the sailing of the allied forces from Varna to the Crimea. It was postponed until the 20th, then till the 22d, then the 26th—then successively to the 1st, 2d, and 7th of September; that is, the French fleet left Varna on the 5th, and the English sailed from the neighboring port of Baltschick on the 7th." It is admitted that "these delays hazarded not only the success, but even the practicability of the whole design, as between the 15th and 25th of September the great equinoctial gales sweep over the Black Sea, and lash into tempests of the most destructive nature."

The voyage, however, was accomplished in safety, and on the 14th of September the Allies arrived at the Crimea, off a place called the "Old Fort," only about thirty miles north of Sabastopol. The whole army was composed of 27,000 English, 24,000 French, and 8,000 Turks. The landing occupied the 14th, 15th, and 16th of September. At nine o'clock A. M.,

of September 19th, the army began the advance, and on the evening of the same day rested for the night within sight of the Russian forces, strongly intrenched on the banks of the Alma, about twelve miles distant from the "Old Fort." Early in the afternoon of the following day the Allies attacked the stronghold of the enemy, and in less than three hours the Russian intrenchments were successfully stormed, and the Russian army was in full retreat. The English and French troops fought with determined and distinguished bravery, and their victory was complete. But what was decided by this bloody struggle? Bad generalship on the part of the Russians, certainly; but what else? Mr. Russell says,—"This great battle was not decisive, so far as the fate of Sebastopol was concerned, merely because we lacked either the means or the military genious to make it so." The victory was not followed up, the retreating foe were not pursued, ample time was given to the enemy to reorganize and retrieve their losses, and the evening of the eventful 20th September found the allied forces no nearer the capture of Sebastopol than they were before the battle.

Did "the Alma" crown the allied generals with fresh and well-earned laurels? We appeal once more to Mr. Russell: "I may inquire, Was there any generalship shown by any of the allied generals at the Alma? We have Lord Raglan painted by one of his staff, trotting in front of his army, amid a shower of balls, 'just as if he were riding down Rotten Row,' with a kind nod for every one, and leaving his generals to fight it out as the best they could; riding across the stream through the French Riflemen, not knowing where he was going to, or where the enemy were, till fate led him to a little knoll, from which he saw some of the Russian guns on his flank; whereupon he sent an order to Turner's battery for guns, and seemed surprised that they could not be dragged across a stream and up a hill which presented some difficulties to an unencumbered horseman; then cantering off to join the Guards just ere they made their charge, and finding it all over while he was in a hollow of the ground." Lord Raglan, let it be remembered, was the Commander-in-Chief of the English forces. And again: "The Light Division was strangely handled. Sir George Brown, whose sight was so indifferent that he had to get one of his offi-

cers to lead his horse across the river, seemed not to know where his division was. . . . . If the conduct of a campaign be a succession of errors, the Crimean expedition was certainly carried on *secundum artem.*" Once more, on the same point, and quoting from the same authority: "All the Russian officers with whom I have conversed, all the testimony I have heard or read, coincide on these two points: first, that, if, on the 25th, we had moved to Bakschiserai in pursuit of the Russians, we should have found their army in a state of the most complete demoralization, and might have forced the great majority of them to surrender as prisoners of war, in a sort of *cul-de-sac*, from which but few could have escaped; secondly, that, had we advanced directly against Sebastopol, the town would have surrendered, after some slight show of resistence to save the honor of the officers." Certainly, such generalship as this did not promise very well for the results of the campaign.

Let us follow the movements of the Allies a little farther. On the morning of September 25th, the combined forces took up their line of march southward. On the 26th, they reached and occupied the town of Balaklava, about six miles distant from Sebastopol. On the 28th of the same month, Lord Raglan wrote to the Duke of Newcastle, then Secretary of War, "We are busily engaged in disembarking our siege-train and provisions, and we are most desirous of undertaking the attack of Sebastopol *without the loss of a day.*" And yet it is not until October 10th, that the Allies commence digging their trenches before the town. Meanwhile the allied army was anxious and impatient. "'When will the siege commence?' was the constant inquiry of the wearied and expectant troops. 'To-morrow,' was the usual response, 'most probably to-morrow.' But day after day came and went, and the Allies still rusted in inaction, while the Russians worked day and night at strengthening their defences." "The time dragged heavily on; still the Russians worked with incredible industry, and still the cannon of the Allies had not yet opened their thunders upon Sebastopol." On the 17th of October, twenty-one days after the occupation of Balaklava, the allied forces commenced fire by land and sea on the stronghold of the enemy. The bombardment continued from half-past six A. M., until nightfall, but is conceded to

have been a complete and mortifying failure. From this time until the 5th of November, it will not be contended that any substantial advantage was gained by the invading forces, or that material progress was made towards the reduction of the Russian Gibraltar.

Then came the battle of Inkerman, a gallant and desperate *sortie* of the Russians, bravely and successfully resisted by the besiegers. The loss of life on both sides was terrible. To what extent was *this* battle decisive? Mr. Russell shall give his own testimony on this point: "We had nothing to rejoice over, and almost everything to deplore, in the battle of Inkerman. We defeated the enemy, indeed, but had not advanced one step nearer the citadel of Sebastopol." In other words, the Allies had repulsed the Russians, but had barely escaped annihilation, while, from having been the besiegers, they became the besieged, and remained so until largely reinforced from home. "A heavy responsibility," says Mr. Russell, "rests on those whose neglect enabled the enemy to attack us where we were least prepared for it, and whose indifference led them to despise precautions which, taken in time, might have saved us many valuable lives, and have trebled the loss of the enemy." The English not only committed the serious error of underrating the enemy, and neglecting the most ordinary precautions against surprise, but, during the whole of the desperate and bloody fight, they gave no proof whatever of generalship. The stubborn, unyielding bravery of the troops was the salvation of the army. "We owed the victory, such as it was, to strength, not to superior intelligence and foresight. It was a soldiers' battle, in which we were saved by the muscle, nerve, and courage of our men." Humanity shudders and the heart sickens over the sufferings of that gallant army of martyrs to Cabinet incapacity and military imbecility during the long and dreary winter of 1854–55.

On the 9th of April, 1855, commenced the second grand bombardment of Sebastopol, which, though continuing for twelve days, resulted, like the first, in mortifying failure, no serious or irreparable injuries being caused to the main defences of the enemy. "The real strength of the place remained unimpaired. That which was injured during the day the Russians

repaired as if by magic during the night. The particulars of this twelve days' bombardment are wearisome. The same wasted energy, the same night skirmishes without effect, the same battering and repairing, the same unwearied exertions on the part of the Allies and wonderful endurance and resistance on the part of the Russians, together with, on each side, the same loss of life and frightful mutilations."

Two months were passed in comparative inaction, the sad monotony being varied only by ineffective sorties and indecisive skirmishes. On the 18th of June the first grand assault of the Malakoff and Redan was attempted. The allied troops displayed the utmost gallantry, and did all that brave men could do under disgracefully incompetent commanders, but were repulsed with horrible slaughter. No one can read the details of the fruitless massacre, without fully confirming the indignant testimony of an intelligent eye-witness, writing from the camp:

"I know not what may have been the feelings of your home public, on reading the telegraphic news of our defeat, (for I presume the scribes at headquarters made no attempt to conceal the naked truth, that our repulse was neither more or less than a defeat,) but here mingled shame and indignation were general throughout the camp. Officers and men alike felt that disgrace had been incurred, and that solely in consequence of the unredeemed mismanagement of their generals. Remembering the confusion which characterized the commencement of our movement, and coupling this with the murderous preparations made by the enemy, you will be at no loss to understand that success was most improbable. During the whole affair, Lord Raglan and Sir George Brown were ensconced within our eight-gun battery; but, though this afforded a good view of the scene of the struggle, and of the disorder which marked it, they appeared to be unable to give any efficient directions for the correction of our multipled blunders. When the whole sad scene was ended, our men straggled back to the camp in a state of dispirited confusion, well in keeping with the mob-like disorder in which they had been throughout the assault."

The final bombardment of Sebastopol took place on the 5th of September, followed on the 8th by the renewed assault of the French on the Malakoff and of the English on the Redan. Skillful generalship, adequate forces,

and desperate bravery gave victory to the French, and "the key to Sebastopol" remained in their hands. Meanwhile the English assault upon the Redan was repulsed with frightful sacrifice of life. It will not be contended that the French owed any part of their success to superior good fortune. Indeed, all the extrinsic advantages were on the side of the English. The French were to lead off in the assault, and the tri-color waving over the captured fortification was to be the signal for the advance of the English. If the French succeeded, every sentiment of personal ambition and national pride would stimulate their allies to achieve an equal victory. If the French failed, the English had only to remain in their trenches.

Now let us examine the comparative generalship displayed in the two assaults. We are quite willing that English authority should draw the contrast. "The preparations of the French were actually scientific in their vigorous attention to every matter calculated to lead to victory; nothing appeared to have been forgotten, nothing neglected. Even the watches of the leading officers had been regulated, that there might not be the smallest error with regard to time. It is a painful reflection that this carefulness of preparation, and prescience with respect to probabilities, was not shown by the English general and his associates in arranging the mode of attack. When the orders were promulgated, on the 7th, many officers shook their heads doubtingly, and observed, in deprecating tones, 'This looks like another 18th of June.' It was generally observed that the attacking columns were not strong enough, that they were too far behind, and that the trenches did not afford room for a sufficient number of men."

The signal for the French assault was given; thirty thousand men, weary of long inactivity, and burning to add new lustre to the bright record of their country's military glory—drums and trumpets meanwhile sounding the charge, and the air resounding with shouts of "*Vive l'Empereur*"—darted from their trenches, swarmed up the embankments, dashed over the parapet, swept the enemy like chaff before them, and the Malakoff was won. Hours of the fiercest fighting found the French still masters of the situation; at nightfall the Russian

general sullenly drew off his defeated forces, and the victory was complete.

It is painful to turn from this brilliant picture to the sombre coloring and the dreary details of the attack on the Redan. To three thousand doomed men was assigned the perilous undertaking. Incredible as it may appear, in view of previous failure, there seems to have been no adequate preparation, no intelligible plan, no competent leader. It was simply brute force assailing brute force. The few men who actually entered the Redan neglected to spike the guns; no reinforcements came to their aid; everything was blind excitement, and headlong, undisciplined haste. "The men of the different regiments became mingled together in inextricable confusion. The Nineteenth men did not care for the officers of the Eighty-eighth, nor did the soldiers of the Twenty-third heed the command of an officer who did not belong to their regiment. The officers could not find their men—the men lost sight of their officers." But why dwell on what soon became mere butchery? The loss of the storming party, in killed, wounded, and missing, was 2,447!

Considered as a military movement, it would seem to be conceded that no grosser blunder could have been made than the selection of so small a force for so desperate an undertaking. There was no chance of success but by attacking simultaneously both flanks and the salient of the Redan. The storming party was barely large enough for the assault of the salient, thus exposing the handful of men to a murderous and fatally destructive fire from the flanks. This was bad enough, certainly, but worse remains behind. English critics have most severely censured our generals for sometimes placing new recruits in posts of danger, requiring cool heads, steady nerves, and the habits of discipline. Perhaps they have forgotten the following incident. Among the picked men selected out of the entire British forces as this very storming party, were raw recruits from the Ninety-seventh regiment, who were designated for this perilous service as a punishment for their cowardice in a recent skirmish! —and to make this punishment still more severe, they were ordered to *lead off* in the assault! An historian of the war says: "The inexperience of some of these recruits seems almost incredible.

One young fellow, who came to the field-hospital with a broken arm and a bullet in his shoulder, carried his firelock with him, but confessed that he had never fired it off, *as he was unable to do so.* The piece, upon being examined, was found to be in perfect order. Such poor, undisciplined lads, fresh from the plough, ought never on any occasion to have been pitted against the well-drilled soldiers of Russia; but it was something worse than blundering to lead them on to the assault of a formidable work like the Redan. Such generalship recalls to our mind the remark of the Russian officer with regard to the military force of England, that 'it was an army of lions led by donkeys.'" Mr. Russell states that many of these recruits "had only been enlisted a few days, and had never fired a rifle in their lives."

Now, will it be believed that General Codrington, to whom was committed the planning and directing of this ill-starred and disastrous enterprise, succeeded Sir James Simpson as commander-in-chief of Her Majesty's forces in the Crimea? How must the shade of Admiral Byng have haunted Her Majesty's Government, unless it was a most forgiving ghost! If General Codrington's promotion could have been delayed a little more than eighteen months, it might have occurred appropriately on the centennial anniversary of the death of that ill-fated naval commander, convicted by court-martial and shot for "not doing his utmost!"

On the evening of the 8th of September, the Russians blew up their magazines, fired the buildings, and evacuated the town. So fell Sebastopol, after a siege of three hundred and forty-five days. It has been considered by the English a bit of very choice pleasantry to allude to our oft-recurring statement, that "the decisive blow had been struck," and that "the backbone of the Rebellion was broken." It may not be impertinent to remind them, that the report, first circulated in France and England in the latter part of September, 1854, and fortified by minute details, that Sebastopol—the backbone of Russian resistance to the allied arms—had fallen, was repeated and reiterated from time to time during the war, until the phrase, "*Sebastopol est pris*," passed into a by-word, and did good service in relieving the cruelly overworked Greek Kalends.

And now we come naturally to the consideration of another

and an important inquiry. Did the beginning of the war find, or did its progress develop or create, a single English general of commanding military capacity, competent to handle in the field even so small an army as the British contingent in the Crimea? Of Lord Raglan Mr. Russell says, and without doubt says truly: "That he was a great chief, or even a moderately able general, I have every reason to doubt, and I look in vain for any proof of it, whilst he commanded the English army in the Crimea." Another authority says: "The conviction that he was not a great general is universal and uncontradicted. He could perform the ordinary duties of a general satisfactorily, but he was lamentably deficient in those qualities which constitute military genius. He possessed considerable professional experience, great application, and remarkable powers of endurance; but he lacked the energy, vehemence, and decision of character which are essential to the constitution of a successful military chieftain." To his hesitation in council, and his want of energy and promptness in action, have always been attributed, in large measure, the ruinous delays and the fearful suffering in the army which he commanded. Lord Raglan died in June, 1855, in his sixty-seventh year. General Simpson succeeded him. "It was believed at the time," writes Mr. Russell, "and now is almost notorious, that he opposed his own appointment, and bore testimony to his own incapacity." "He was slow and cautious in council, and it is no wonder that where Lord Raglan failed, General Simpson did not meet with success." The English press and people demanded his recall. His incompetency was everywhere acknowledged, and indeed he himself would have been the last man to deny it. In about three months from the date of General Simpson's appointment, "the Queen was graciously pleased to permit him to resign the command of the army." As we have already seen, his place was filled by General Codrington. This officer was as signally rewarded, because he had failed, as he could have been, if he had succeeded. Mr. Russell quotes approvingly the comment of a French officer upon this appointment: "If General Codrington had taken the Redan, what more could you have done for him than to make him General, and to give him command of the army? But he did not take it, and he is made General

and Commander-in-Chief." With equal discrimination, Sir James Simpson was created Field-Marshal! The remainder of the campaign gave General Codrington no further opportunity of displaying his qualities for command. No other important action occurred before the termination of hostilities.

Great credit is certainly due to Mr. Russell for fearlessly exposing the errors and incompetency of the three officers successively at the head of the English army, in spite of "much obloquy, vituperation, and injustice," and for bearing his invariable and eloquent testimony to the bravery, endurance, and patience of the British private soldier.

In this brief recital of English blunders during the Crimean war, we have made no mention of the desperate and disastrous "charge of the light brigade," the gross and culpable inefficiency of the Baltic fleet under Admiral Sir Charles Napier, and other instances of military incapacity no less monstrous. Enough, however, has been told to more than justify the very mild summing-up of Mr. Russell, that the "war had exposed the weakness of our military organization in the grave emergencies of a winter campaign, and the canker of a long peace was unmistakably manifested in our desolated camps and decimated battalions."

Why should we add to this dismal recital the appalling suffering of the soldiers—helpless victims to bad management at home and shameful neglect in the field—the long, freezing nights of trench-work under a driving rain, "without warm or water-proof clothing—the trenches two and three feet deep with mud, snow, and half-frozen slush, so that many, when they took off their shoes, were unable to get their swollen feet into them again, and might be seen barefooted about the camp, the snow half a foot deep on the ground," creeping for shelter into "miserable tents pitched as it were at the bottom of a marsh, where twelve or fourteen unhappy creatures lay soaking without change of clothing," until they were called out again to their worse than slave labor—disease, brought on by exhaustion, exposure, overwork, and deficient food, sweeping the men off by thousands, and yet no sufficient supply of medical stores and no adequate number of medical attendants, not a soul seeming to care for their comfort or even for their lives—so neglected

and ill-treated that "the wretched beggar who wandered about the streets of London led the life of a prince compared with the British soldiers who were fighting for their country, and who were complacently assured by the home authorities that they were the best-appointed army in Europe." The world knows the whole sad story by heart. And is it not written in the volumes of evidence sworn to before the Commission appointed by Parliament to inquire into the condition of the army?

Nor is it necessary to dwell upon the extent to which the home administration was responsible for the general mismanagement of the war, in its main features, and its minute details, nor the thoroughly English stolidity with which all complaints were received by every member of the Government, from the cabinet minister who dictated pompous and unmeaning despatches, down to the meanest official who measured red tape, nor the intense and universal popular indignation which, after a year "full of horrors," compelled the resignation of the Aberdeen Ministry. Lord Derby did not, perhaps, overstate the verdict of the nation, when he said in the House of Lords: "From the very first to the very last, there has been apparent in the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government a want of previous preparation, a total want of prescience; and they have appeared to live from day to day providing for each successive exigency *after it arose, and not before it arose.* Too LATE have been the fatal words applicable to the whole conduct of Her Majesty's Government in the course of the war." The change in the ministry, however, by no means cured all the evils which had existed; for, although the sufferings of the soldiers—thanks in large part to the providential appearance and heroic conduct of Florence Nightingale—were greatly diminished, still, as we have seen, the military blunders continued to the close of the war.

Now, if we do not greatly mistake, the lesson which this country should learn from the mortifying experience of the English army in the Crimea is not one of exultation over its lamentable and unnecessary errors, but rather of indifference to the insulting criticism of a nation which can so ill afford to be critical, and of determination to profit in every possible way by those blunders which might have been avoided. The his-

tory of all wars, moreover, should teach us that now and then there comes a time when to hold the olive-branch in one hand and the sword in the other, especially if the olive-branch is kept in the foreground and the sword in the background, involves not only a sad waste of energy, but is mistaken kindness to our enemies.

Use every weapon which the God of Battles has placed in our hands. Put forth all the power of the nation. Encourage and promote all fighting generals; cashier all officers who are determined to make war on peace principles; arm, equip, and discipline negroes, not to burn, plunder, and massacre, but to meet their and our enemies in fair and open fight.* Demonstrate to the world that we are terribly in earnest. Waste no time in discussing the chance of foreign intervention. Postpone polygamy in Utah, African colonization, everything, to the engrossing and emergent crisis which now confronts the Government. Make the contest sharp, short and decisive. Put down the Rebellion, vindicate the majesty of the Law, the sacredness of the Union, and the integrity of the Constitution. There will be time enough, after this is done, to discuss all minor questions and all collateral issues. One paramount duty lies directly before us. Let us perform this duty fearlessly, and leave the future with God.

---

* The opposition to the employment of negro regiments, if made by traitors North or South, can be easily comprehended; if made by loyal men, is wholly inexplicable. Your neighbor's house takes fire at night. The flames, long smouldering, make rapid progress, and threaten the comfort, certainly, if not the lives of the household, and the total destruction of his property. The alarm is given. An engine comes promptly to the rescue. It is just in season to save his dwelling. The firemen spring with ready alacrity to their places. But stop! He suddenly discovers the appalling fact that they are negroes! True, there is not a moment to be lost. No other engine is, or can be, within helping distance. The least delay means poverty and a houseless family. And yet he rudely dismisses the dusky remen, folds his arm with Spartan stoicism, and, looking complacently on the burning building, says: "*Better this than to rely on the assistance of niggers!*" *Is it* Spartan stoicism? Is it not rather stark lunacy? And would you not take immediate measures to provide such a man with permanent quarters in a madhouse?

AN

ADDRESS TO KING COTTON.

SIRE:

You have committed a wrong act. It is not everything to be a king, even with only a bale for a throne: one must also be faithful to the Constitution. I talk to you without flattery, and as I have broached the subject, I shall go to the end of the reel. But first let me throw a retrospective glance at the past.

If in the 16th century, at the time when Thomas Morus wrote his Utopia..... but this is going too far back. Suppose in the 17th century, while Fénelon was elaborating his kingdom of Salente, a seer had spoken to this effect: "I have found a telescope that plunges into time as the other fathoms space! But my glass shows me something still more marvellous than the Utopia of Morus, or the Salente of the archbishop of Cambrai.

Beyond the setting sun, on the other side of the Atlantic, I see a tract of continent twenty times as large as France, with two sides on two oceans, the one looking toward Europe, the other toward Asia. One might deem it the middle of the world, the central empire. At the first glance it seems an uncouth territory, overgrown with jungles and submerged by swamps. Some sixty rivers, nameless as yet, flow at random, barring one's path in all directions. There are no inhabitants but the wolf and the bison, save here and there a man if we may thus call carnivorous creatures, who after six thousand years of reflection have been unable to acquire any other talent than that of lighting a fire at night by which to cook their food.

And yet this chaotic soil, rude as the deluge left it, will be chosen by good men, banished from England on account of a dubious point of biblical interpretation, as an asylum for themselves, their wives and children, so that they may have a right to interpret the Bible in their own way.

How many will they number? A mere handful of men, barely a boat load. They will sing a psalm upon landing in this new hemisphere and then with a pious glance at the snow-covered soil, they will take up the pickax.

They will have but one ambition; prayer and labor—prayer in order to gain the life to come and labor to gain time for prayer. After clearing the seabord they will bravely attack the barriers of the untrodden forest; they will deliver the soil, buried and imprisoned beneath a night of verdure; they will show it openly to heaven and heaven will let its dews and harvests descend upon it.

Forward, ever advancing, go ahead, will be the motto of this heroic race.

This rugged land conceals the germ of kindly usefulness. It awaits but a word from man to pass into a state of civilization. There are immense lakes, or rather seas, destined to create a coasting trade ; and the sixty rivers, although obstacles at the outset, will become later great highways, binding together the various centres of population. And at last the great Mississippi, the "father of waters," will draw all these navigable streams in his course of a thousand leagues and bear them along in triumph with their fleets to the Gulf of Mexico.

And they will advance ever and ever westward, (for civilization follows the course of the sun,) and wherever they go they will find the same climate as in England ; the same winter and the same summer. They may believe if they will, that they have brought the seasons of Europe with them, sewn in the folds of their cloaks. They will be able to carry to their new home the productions of the old country; their wheat and hemp; their gardens and orchards. They will be able to carry with them the companions of their early life,—the ox, the horse, the dog, the sheep, &c. Men and flocks will land in families, and after a voyage of fifteen hundred leagues, they will seem to have passed to the other shore of their own country.

II.

But a day will come when this colony, scarcely a century old, born of labor and multiplied by labor, will wish to rise and rank as a nation, and manage its own household. Then it will have to struggle desperately with the mother-country, the first maritime power, and perhaps also the first military power of Europe. But North America will have confidence in her destiny. An inward voice will say to her : "Do what you fear to do ! After the strife with nature, comes the strife with England. This will only be changing the battlefield, and America will win the day. She will force England to sign the certificate of birth of the United States, and on the morrow the Atlantic will bear for the first time a flag with but thirteen stars as yet."

I do not know how or by what secret instinct more powerful than reflection the American republic will find the most perfect form of government to occupy and rule half a continent ; but it will be found, whether at the first or the second trial it matters little. Man, master of himself in everything concerning the individual ; a common independence in all his acts regarding his religious existence ; corporate sovereignty in everything of interest to the people constituted as a state ; and lastly the confederacy as the supreme umpire in all matters in which the states are jointly interested, this is the American Constitution. In other words it is social life copied from nature and written down upon paper.

The sovereign people will delegate power to it, still always retaining their sovereignty. Administration, juries, legislation, government and all power will emanate from the people to be restored to the people at the expiration of their mandate.

Public election will constitute in some degree a distilling apparatus which will be constantly at work, and through which public opinion will evaporate in power. In addition to all this a president will be elected who will rule over thirty millions of men for the low sum of one hundred and twenty thousand francs per annum and who will live in a cottage. At the end of his term he will disappear in the crowd and take to sowing wheat and clover.

An admirable organization is this, producing at the same time a double movement of expansion and concentration ; an expansion colonising from without, a concentration binding the various colonies together in one united country. And thus the American Constitution will surround liberty with as many breastworks as there may be states in the confederacy, so that of all impossibilities the most impossible would be the hypothesis of a Yankee Cæsar with his foot upon the corpse of the republic striving to mount to sovereign power.

As American emigration clears away what will be called simply a territory, the starry constitution will travel westward almost step by step in company with the nomadic labor of the pioneer. When this new territory shall have attained a legal amount of population, the constitution will take hold of it at once and incorporate it in the family of states ; and one more star will shine upon the banner of the republic.

The confederacy will thus grow constantly from these cuttings, embracing all the newly-hatched colonies in the West in the simple bonds of a unity that will protect all the integral parts of the Union without ever being able to hold any one of them in bondage. Still who will believe it? This model constitution will result in a degree from chance or if you prefer it from a compromise. A hidden destiny will doubtless dictate it, as though it had one day to support a world.

III.

Liberty alone possesses creative power ; and thanks to liberty the American republic will expand in space—man will outstrip time in speed. When the twelth or the fifteenth son of the same father reaches the age of reason, he will harness up a wagon and load it with the emigrant's Spartan outfit ; then embrace his family and drive away.

Where will he go ? To the great West. After picking out a suitable tract of public land, he will attack the forest with his ax, sow his corn in a clearing, and build his log cabin on the outskirts of the wood. When he has raised a roof above his head, he will think that two heads might rest there as well as one ; after this reflection he will light his pipe, get into the saddle, and return to the village of his childhood.

He will go there to seek a companion, and will marry the first comer. He may draw blindly in the lottery, but he will always find the spirit of order and labor. Virtue is the only dowry of America's daughters. As to any other dowry, it will not be thought of. How are the children to live? They will emigrate in their turn.

As soon as the pioneer receives the nuptial blessing, he will return to his log cabin, taking his wife with him : but this time he will take furniture and cattle along. Sometime later, a traveling missionary sent to spread the Gospel in the wilderness, will check his horse before a newly built farm house; at the sight of a swarm of little ones playing on the threshold under a portico of fragrant vines.

Man draws near to man in the chemistry of society, as one atom attracts another, in another order of composition. A new cabin will spring up in the neighborhood of the one already built, for reasons both of sympathy and safety. Soon manufacturing industry will compete with agriculture. The blacksmith will light his forge fire by the side of the homestead, to hammer out his ploughshares ; the wheelwright will follow the blacksmith, and then the carpenter, and so on, until the tailor arrives. Agriculture disperses and

manufactures concentrate. The village will owe its birth to the latter. Need I designate the first public edifice to be built with the savings of the community? It will be a schoolhouse.

And why should it not? Is not the Bible the worship of the Protestant pioneer? Does not his piety come from reading? Is it not the first evidence of a free citizen of a free country to be able to read at least his newspaper? Religion will first lodge in the schoolhouse: but in course of time it will have a separate residence: a church with its steeple will arise and the church bells will tell the winds of the birth of a new community.

Thould there exist any local circumstances favorable to its developement the community will grow almost magically. What was but a village will change into a little town, then into an ordinary sized town, and at last into a great city, the metropolis of a hundred thousand souls. A hundred thousand, what am I saying, *four* hundred thousand, and all this, within the life of one man, and upon a soil where only yesterday the buffalo browsed at liberty.

What will it become then, when steam gives American civilization a soul equal to its aspirations? Everything to be done thenceforth,—agricultural or industrial—must be done by machinery. The soil must be tilled, and the harvest reaped by machinery. The entire surface of the earth will become one immense machine, ever panting with labor. Armed with steam power, North America will defy impossibilities, and even attempt to imitate miracles. For example, a railroad one thousand leagues in length, will be laid down, and the engine darting through the immensity of space, will call up with a shrill whistle, the yet buried phantom of future cities, and these cities, will spring from the ground at the call of steam, to take their places in the sunlight.

IV.

The news of this great prosperity and its unprecedented rapidity will cross the sea, and the people of the old world, deprived of their share in the soil will cross the Atlantic, and cover the predestined land of the West with a living alluvium. It will be a crusade of labor. All the energy of Europe, (for it takes strong nerve to submit to expatriation), will thus concur to swell the energy of America; and from their combination, and from the action and reaction of their double electricity a new and unexpected race will arise; one that will grow an inch in each generation.

The Saxon element will prove the richest soil, and will give the deepest impress to this new civilization. It will lead foreign emigrants to the worship of labor and of liberty, the parent of labor. It will fulfil a purpose similar to the great tun at Heidelberg, into which new wine was poured each year, that it might at once partake of the nature of the old. Then a being hitherto unknown will appear; the last type of man; man master of himself; man his own sovereign, his own policeman, his own priest; the I absolute, the Yankee. He will not wait for the government to protect him, he will protect himself, nor for the State to enrich him, he will make his own fortune; nor wait for the government to designate his religion in the budget, for he will choose his own religion himself, supporting it out of his savings.

There will be no more oppression, either of conscience or any other species; no oppression of one class by another, or of all classes of society by a permanent army. North America will only have an army for appearance

sake, consisting at most of twelve thousand men, disseminated in little bands over the entire extent of her territory. There, there will be no unpleasant traces of the past, no law of primogeniture, no exclusive academies, no embroidery of distinctive rank, no crosses and decorations, no cringing courtiers, no sinecure officers, no charity under the name of reward. Men will be estimated at their real value ; nothing will be respected save work and money—the incarnation of labor ; but it will have to be earned by the sweat of one's brow, for the *Dolce far niente* will be looked upon in America as a robbery committed upon society in general. On the other hand every sort of trade will become glorious. Work, no matter in what manner ; be what you list, bootmaker, tailor, gardener or lawyer ; choose your own calling, provided that you loyally furnish your tribute of labor. In America every trade has its own nobility ; the President of the republic may be chosen from a carpenter's shop.

A seer might have spoken thus two centuries since ; but had he done so, he would have been treated as a visionary, he might perhaps even been publicly burnt, as duly attainted and convicted of dealings with the evil one. And still the prophecy would have been but an anticipation of the reality ; for if a nation has ever existed in the universe that has done honor to the species, that nation is North America, with its motto, "God and Liberty," and which, with the Bible in one hand and the ax in the other, has cleared the surface of a world in a twinkling, and shown man in all the splendor of virtue.

In the very air of this new country, there is an indefinable breathing of its juvenile nature, an inexplicable strength that expands one's chest, an exhuberant healthfulness in its exhalations that fortifies both body and mind. There is in the daily labors of the pioneer, alone with Providence, a something of religion which in a manner elevates the soul to the mountain tops. In this poetical and odorous laboratory of agriculture, with no roof but the heavens, no boundary save the horizon, there exists a continual resemblance to the Infinite, reminding man of his ultimate destiny.

But while the American race was growing great by labor, what were you doing, Sire, on your part, you and your partisans? You were looking jealously upon the constantly increasing prosperity of your Western neighbor, for whom you felt a fraternal friendship like that of Cain. You were conspiring secretly in order to establish the kingdom of cotton and the supremacy of cotton shirts upon the ruins of the republic.

But you were so unfortunate as to have been born too near the sun, in a colony of bad origin whose godfather was the prince of libertines, and whose godmother was the scum of the jacobite army. The first viceroy called by Locke's constitution to the rule of Carolina was, I believe, General Monk, a bedizened traitor who sold the liberty of his country for money. Your ancestor was a scoundrel, Sire ; and you have not disgraced your descent.

V.

Why then do you wish to rend asunder this splendid American republic, the joy and glory of humanity ? We must know it for the instruction of this century, and that man may learn to do his duty alway despite everything. The American Constitution certainly compassed the ultimatum of wisdom ; but it lacked courage in one clause, and this weakness was destined one day to compromise the very existence of the confederacy. Provi-

dence does not allow evil to remain in what is good. When it as once entered it acts like the lead in a wound ; either the wound expels the missile or the metal aggravates the wound until death ensues.

When America became possessed of liberty slavery already existed in a portion of the country : but the day that she solemnly proclaimed before God the right of every man to happiness, she should have placed the reality in harmony with the principle, without futile distinctions. She was afraid of justice and dared neither abolish nor recognize slavery ; she did not even dare name it. It was tacitly permitted as though a question of this nature could be passed over and avoided in silence ; but in truth its solution was entrusted to time.

But time only accepts such drafts by doubling the debt of the past. The longer emancipation was put off the more aggravated did the difficulty become, and to you, Sire, is due the credit of the spread of this scourge. The very moment that some poor devil, accidentally but honestly, found an infernal machine to pick cotton, you transformed the South into a cotton plantation. And in order to cultivate this plantation the special labor of the slave became necessary.

What is a slave ? Those black metaphysicians who wish to elevate servitude into a theory in order to quiet their consciences, give us such a poetic idyl of negro existence that we needs must re-assert the truth in the euphemism "involuntary labor."

Slavery is thus termed so as to spare the delicacy of "ears polite." You, yourself, Sire, posted as you are in the matter, never call it except by a periphrase. In your code, if I am not mistaken, you designate it the "peculiar institution." Barefaced as you are in reality, you at least show humanity in this title ; and in this you imitate the inquisition which always dealt in euphemisms toward its victims ; thus the torture room was termed the "*casa santa*" and upon the stake was inscribed the word "*misericordia.*"

But what is a slave ? A slave is a man robbed of his soul, he and his race, until the end of posterity ; a man doomed from father to son to think with the brains and will through the volition of another; a man divested of the first sacred right of man ; to wit, individuality ; a being changed from his nature ; in a word an artificial monster, a moral ennuch, undeserving of the deprivation. The church castrates the child to make him sing well, but you, Sire, you castrate him that he may pick your cotton. This is the only difference.

If in order to render a man a slave it were necessary to cut off one of his legs or arms, the sight of the knife and of the stump would certainly in the end excite pity ; and pity once raised what might not ensue.

But the white man, having tired of cutting and maiming, finally wished to leave the negro entire. In order to transform a man into an automaton it suffices to take away his soul gently ; and as this requires neither knife nor surgical operation, as it causes neither outcries nor bloodshed the world looks on quietly. After all it is only a metaphysical murder committed in the realms of the invisible. We do not see or touch it and we sleep with a sound conscience. And yet, whatever may be said in the country of yellow fever or sugar cane, there is more cruelty in mutilating him physically. Place the one against the other and were fate to summon us to choose we should certainly prefer the loss of a leg to that of our intelligence, we had rather lose an arm than our will.

Servitude in common with every human institution has its own logic. Emanating from barbarity it leads from cruelty to cruelty, as result follows result in reasoning.

You feed the slave while in infancy (I had nearly added while in old

age also ; but forced labor beneath a tropical sun rarely allows him to grow old) therefore the negro must earn by his daily labor not only his present but his past sustenance ; but the negro has no interest to stimulate him to work, so you supply its place with the whip. This is your idea of the perfection of labor ; but this is not all : discipline must be maintained in this band of scourged creatures, giddy and noisy as children.

The raw hide teaches him to keep order and to love his master or mistress. Both in France and in England by a braminical species of law cruelty to animals is punishable ; but in America the skin of man is not held in such high esteem. There the negro's blood is shed upon the slightest provocation, for a petty blunder.

It was evening. The sun was fading away in a golden mist. Upon a verandah beneath the shade of the blossoming vanilla a young creole woman was enjoying the cool evening She was a mother for the first time and the mysterious feeling of maternity thrilled her heart. She looked up into the heavens dreamily, when suddenly she heard a piercing cry, then a stifled sigh. For an instant she listened, then with a smile she bent over the odor of a rose. In this attitude she was beautiful as the Madonna.

A pregnant negress had been tied to a ladder and they were whipping her poetically by the light of the setting sun. Do you know what she had done? She had broken a saucer. They had to take a round out of the ladder to make room for the bosom where the Almighty had deposited a soul.

VI.

Sire, you go regularly to church every Sunday. You must consent therefore, out of respect to the gospel, to allow the slave to become, if not a man, at least a christian. Let him be baptised in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and by virtue of his baptism he will be granted a place in the city of the dead and equality in paradise. But there is a slight drawback which you did not at first foresee, in that the Bible constitutes the whole Protestant worship. You should therefore, Sire, as a Protestant, teach the slave to read so as to make him a good christian. But when he learns to read what will he read?

You may refuse to allow the slave to exercise his intelligence, but you cannot root this intelligence out of his brain. His intellect works even under the yoke, although confusedly as though under a fog. What would it be then—were his mind to become educated and were he to learn that you were no better than himself, and say to you let it be decided between us ! Man to man !

You foresaw the danger of this, and in order to avert it you made his ignorance the safeguard of slavery. Keeping the slave in ignorance, Sire, this has been your policy. You have closed the schools to the negro, and have hidden the alphabet from him. The Scythians put out the bodily eyes of their slaves as a prudential measure ; but you treat your slaves infinitely more cruelly, for you put out their mental eyes; and the negro, who is created after God's image like yourself, will go henceforth from the cradle to the grave with night in his soul and night on his face.

You have elevated him to christianity, probably that he may practice the gospel, and the gospel condemns promiscuousness. You take pains that the blacks shall intermarry, and a clergyman blesses their union. Why should it be blessed ? Rather let it be cursed and the woman be rendered barren, for

she will only bring forth heirs to slavery. And the children born of this love, whom she has nourished at her breast and cherished in her heart what will become of them when they reach a marketable age? The master will send them to market, and marriage, the most moral of all institutions, becomes but another torment added to slavery.

Without irony, let the inmates of the negro pen be considered simply as male and female; let them come together and bring forth after the lapse of nine months; let them mix indiscriminately; let the mmeet promiscuously and then forget each other; this will do for negroes. Why have any marriages at all? And the young white girl, Sire, your own daughter will receive her education in this school. I say nothing of your son: I know already what his first love affair will be.

Occasionally the slave takes to flight. In local phraseology, he *vamoses*. The swamps are deserted and the underwood dense. By sleeping during the day and traveling at night, he may be able to gain the border. What do you do to recapture him? You train up a pack of bloodhounds to track the runaway. The slave owner has a right to hunt him, and if he chooses to risk the thousand dollars represented by his human game, he may shoot at him, and kill him, — the law allows it.

And these nameless crimes, these insults to God and man, are not repugnant to, and do not even astonish the gentle blue-eyed creoles, the wives and sisters of the knights of the whip! The frequency of their occurrence has to a great extent made them a normal state of affairs, an old established tradition, rendered legitimate by custom. What in fact is there to complain of in the negro's destiny? Does he not get enough to eat when he is hungry? Does he not dance at Christmas? Yes, eat or die, such is thy lot; King Cotton has declared it. And if thou shouldst incautiously murmur at thy portion, thy master will send thee to the plantation executioner with an order for fifty lashes, payable to bearer, and the official will pay them at sight without further formality.

You degrade the slave at pleasure; you put him up at auction on a block like butcher's meat. Draw near, here is a negro, or better still a negress; you may examine her at leisure, undress her, turn her round, discuss her price before her, stipulate against any hidden imperfection, and then take possession of the merchandise. If she groans and weeps you may take her away tied to the tail of your horse; the town of Raleigh in North Carolina has witnessed such an act.

And after you have debased the negro, and corrupted him by his degradation, how, Sire, do you satisfy your conscience? You make the slave himself responsible for the effects of slavery: you use his baseness as an argument to maintain him in servitude. But who has branded him with ignominy except you, his master, his second creator? And you have recourse to a second crime in order to justify the first.

You lower the negro to the level of a brute, and then you say that he is not a man. And whose fault is this, I pray; He is not a man, you say; but is not the negress a woman? Yes, when she is young and well made—this you condescend to prove. And the profit is all your own, for later you will be able to sell your own child. A mulatto is more valuable than a full-blooded African.

I will take your word for it that the negro is despicable; but there is one still more despicable than he, to wit; you, yourself, King Cotton. The slave is debased, but you are cruel. Which is to be preferred, a vitiated nature or crime? Moreover the negro is your work, and the work is a criterion of the workman.

The slave being degraded by his master, degrades the latter in his turn.

The master loses his sense of right and wrong ; the planter does wrong without even suspecting that he is doing so. The Cæsarian folly of despotism extinguishes the last symptom of conscience and kills remorse. He is candid in his own crime.

Immorality begets immorality. The burning soil of the South devours the laborer, who can only live there about seven years upon an average. The consumption exceeds the supply, and slavery might die out for want of the raw material; but in the border states, rejoicing in the "peculiar institution," there are good fathers of families, prudently intent upon establishing their sons and endowing their daughters. These men will originate the ingenious idea of profiting by the mildness of a temperate climate to breed up human cattle on a large scale.

These prudent men will seek out well-proportioned brood negresses who will produce first-class stock which they will subsequently dispose of further South at high rates. Sire, I congratulate you upon this stroke of genius : you have invented a new sort of conscription. You may say, as another king once said : "I have so many men to spend upon my battle-field."

But the breeding district will not suffice to supply the slave-market ; something more will be required, and despite the law, despite the penalty of death provided by the law for the slaver captain, the Southron will boldly keep up the slave trade in the open light of day. You will protect him secretly : you will interpose your authority between the criminal and the gallows. When a cruiser brings to Charleston a slaver captured in the exercise of his vocation, the planter-judge will declare that the honest dealer in human flesh has been calumniated, and that he was sailing along the African coast for purely philanthropic purposes, solely in order to offer the advantages of commerce to the black race.

But before long the farce of this underhand traffic, continually pursued with impunity, will prove too revolting to the uprightness of the South, and some honest citizen will demand the rëestablishment of the slave trade openly and undisguisedly. This man merits mention. He is called Doctor Thorwell, and his name should be nailed like a rook to Jefferson Davis' door.

I do not say, Sire, that your Southern vassals are altogether bloodthirsty men, of repulsive mien, whose clothes reek with the professional odor of butchers. On the contrary, they are perfect gentlemen, agreeable, amiable, and always ready to do the honors of their homes with smiling, constant courtesy. They have debts, white hands, and good manners. They are good hunters, riders, and pistol shots. They are fond of painting, music and literature. They look upon labor as derogatory, therefore they do not work ; but they possess all the charms of aristocratic slothfulness, including good-breeding, good-taste, and well-lined purses.

Do not fear that they will ever doubt the rightfulness of slavery. Their theologians of all denominations—and they are more subtle than the most wily casuists of the old school of Ignatius Loyola—have long since relieved the conscience of the planter of all anxiety on this head. These religion-mongers who, like Judas Iscariot, would sell Christ a second time, open their Bible with a pious air, and through the assistance of the Holy Ghost they discover that the Lord eternally empowers the white men of Louisiana to buy black flesh for their use, and to whip the same *ad libitum*.

Whenever a crime is committed in this world there will always be a creature in clerical guise upon its trace, ready to canonize the deed and make God have a hand in it. *Omnis potestas a Deo.* Your chaplain, Sire, has no doubt communicated this text to your august ear, and demonstrated to you from the pulpit that you possess a right of life and death over your fellow-creatures for the public welfare of Cotton.

VII.

Still, North America permitted matters to take their course. She seemed to have good-naturedly consented to the scandal of a republic in two parts, with liberty inscribed upon one page of its constitution and slavery upon the other ; but liberty possesses such virture in itself that if you link it to servitude one of two results must ensue ; either servitude will stifle it, or it will efface the former.

The day was destined to come when men worthy of the name should examine the conscience of the republic and demand whether the living paradox of the "peculiar institution" should still longer dishonor the country of Washington. A voice, low and indistinct at first, rises from Penn's colony, pronouncing the word "abolition;" but timidly like a secret whispered in one's ear.

This first protest astonished, and then irritated even the immaculate North. Why raise thus unseasonably a difficulty of this nature? Why disturb the quiet of those who saw nothing and the peace of those who did not wish to see anything, of those who turned aside their heads aud kept on their way? Therefore the people of Philadelphia grew indignant and set fire to the hall where abolitionism held its first meeting.

Then Channing began to speak, and by the evangelical serenity of his eloquence he gently brought North America to blush for this and to harmonise her policy with that liberty decreed by the heart of man before it was countersigned by the constitution. From thal moment the abolition party weighed in the balance of public opinion with all the weight of justice.

But woe to the ingenuous apostle simple-minded enough to believe, that, under a *régime* of absolute liberty, he had a right to utter his opinions aloud in the streets. If, by chance, he had the impudence to show a lack of respect for the "peculiar institution" or to assert casually that slavery was perhaps not the beau-ideal of civilization, when in the land of good-breeding, the home of your rich, fast planters, well gloved and curled, elegant in Panama hats and white pantaloons, that very instant the unfortunate abolitionist found himself seized by the collar to be tarred and feathered in the State House ; for the knights of the lash are a jovial race and fond of a joke in their idle moments. When they have no slaves to punish with their lordly hands, they love to enjoy a free, hearty laugh, especially after a "cocktail." They hold that since the days of Molière a man daubed with tar is the wittiest thing invented, and they repeat the joke *ad nauseam*.

Still, experience showed the relative value of free labor and slave labor. While free labor in the north of America was incessantly invading the wilderness, peopling the desert, drawing the stout sons of Europe to its ranks, and jointly with them transforming a desert into a nation at every step, servile labor, despite the development of the cultivation of cotton, and notwithstanding that it monopolized the European markets, was barely enabled to keep a people, burdened with debt, at the same level during the same period. With progress on the one hand and stagnation on the other must result the following consequence.

The Senate represents the States. So many states send so many Senators, whatever be their population ; but owing to the increasing flow of emigration the North was alone able to improvise new states and consequently to send new Senators to Congress. The North, therefore, year after year, had a majority in the Senate ; and as the section inclined more and more toward abolitionism, the day drew near to put the slavery question to the vote.

What did the South do in order to restore the equilibrium and retain the majority? Being unable to create new states by their labor, they essayed to conquer such by dint of arms and to sow slavery by force. Thus they got up the Mexican expedition and imposed involuntary labor upon Texas. Labor in vain, the North was always ahead.

The South, feeling that their human property was in danger, thought fit to play a bold game, and on their part to threaten to split the republic in twain. They thus succeeded in obtaining from the easy-going good-natured North, first the Missouri compromise, then its violation, then the extradition law, then the decision of the United States Court placing slave property on a footing with all other kinds of property in every state in the Union. This amounted to rendering slavery universal. The South went too far. Destiny looked on and cried, Halt!

VIII.

But one day an honest man named John Brown tried to discover whether there were any pulsation left beneath the negro's cotton shirt. This was an error, I admit. You seized the noble champion of humanity, you tried him and you hung him. Bravo, Sire, I recognize you by this act of clemency, for you could have burnt him alive at the stake! But when he was executed a great shudder swept through the North of America. Thenceforth the sacred cause of abolitionism was invested with the halo of martyrdom.

It had already sounded its tocsin, in the shape of a paltry little book written by a woman; and it was less than a book, it was a novel. You smiled compassionately at it, did you not? Your children may cry over it for a long while. America read Mrs. Stowe's elegy and bewailed her state; and the presidency of Abraham Lincoln sprang from the presidency of Uncle Tom.

I breathe again. I have rid me of a nightmare, for the time for justice has arrived: right is not a lie. Scarcely had the South learned the election of Lincoln before with their impious hand, already polluted with the blood of the slave, they dared to strike their mother, to strangle the Constitution, throwing to the winds the common glory of their common country, telling the Union their intention to walk thenceforward independently with the negro trampled beneath their feet.

You, Sire, and you alone, without provocation or excuse, have broken the compact which you signed and swore to keep. In your rebellious folly you said to yourself, "What have I to fear from the North, from the lovers of peace and dollars? Will they dare to raise an army for the abstract satisfaction of unity? And supposing that they dare, I need only hold fast to my bales of cotton. At one blow I can cause a famine in all the markets of Europe, and array all the spindles and looms of Manchester and Mulhouse against these fanatical Yankees, and their Constitution. Then England and France must of necessity,—either jointly or separately—intervene in favor of slavery in order to save their cotton.

And if they hesitate, if they shrink from armed mediation, what will they do with their disbanded hosts of cotton spinners? Will they be allowed to wander at random, pale and ragged, like the spectres of famine, about the extinguished furnaces and silent factories, until at last, tired of suffering they make one desperate effort and throw themselves upon the bayonets of their countrymen? Certainly not; France as well as England must prefer to open the Southern markets at any cost, even by force of shot and shell.

This is the impious calculation you made when you rebelled against the Constitution. You condemned the poorer classes of Europe to want for work, in other words, to a slow death, so as to preserve slavery in all its purity ; after adding another crime to your list, you hauled down the federal flag waving over Fort Sumter.

During the last ten years, Sire, you have been silently preparing for civil war. You furnished the first example of a conspirator in the Cabinet. You have overspread the South with an immense network of rabid democracy. Long since you organized the secret society of the Knights of the Golden Circle, the three golden circles inclosed the one within the other, with all the dexterity of a Chinese puzzle. The first was to separate the second, and the second the third, and the countersign passed from one to the other without the possibility of discovering who had given it.

You chose your time well. The Constitution places an interval of three months between the election of the President and his inauguration ; during that period, Buchanan was finishing his presidential term, like a gloomy sunset. He was a man after your own heart, a mind devoted to slavery, a magnetic needle turned to the South pole instead of toward the North, and he conscientiously employed the balance of his presidency in betraying the Union.

Treason is perhaps too forcible an expression—he was not exactly a traitor. But when the rebellion boldly declared itself, when civil war was openly begun, Buchanan was most conveniently affected with a wilful dimness of ocular and mental vision ; he saw nothing, and knew nothing. He sent all the Northern ordnance to the South ; he sent the army to the Western frontier in order to prevent the imminent invasion of a dozen redskins who threatened to pillage the New York banks.

Thus you had three months start of the North. You took them unawares. You had them within range, you had an army while they had but militia. They rushed heedlessly against you at Bull Run, and you butchered them. So there was nothing left but to admit the defeat and beg for mercy!

By no means ! While still under the first shock of the disaster, this peaceful laborious people, thus villainously attacked and abominably massacred in ambuscades, sent back a shout of defiance, and staked everything in the struggle, to its last man and its last dollar.

Heroism is contagious. America offered so magnificent a spectacle to right-minded Europeans, that young princes, ignorant of democracy through the accident of their birth, deemed it an honor to win their spurs beneath the banner of the Republic. The fact is greatly to their credit ; I say it without flattery, for between their principles and our principles, lies the broad Atlantic. For their account I hope, that while serving under the star-spangled banner, they may have learned that there is something higher than princes, that there is the citizen.

IX.

During this time, Sire, you sent agents to Europe to decoy public opinion to the side of slavery. Your legates *à latere* are at this moment dispensing a prodigious amount of philanthropy. They say, or make others say, in affecting tones ; see, blood is being poured out like water ; battles constantly succeed each other and always without result ; after two years slaughter in line upon the banks of the Potomac the North has been unable to advance a step without falling back immediately afterward. The mari-

time nations of Europe should throw themselves between the combatants in imitation of the Sabines. The interests of humanity are at stake as well as your industrial interests.

This is what the missionaries from the South preach to the four corners of the earth. Do not delude yourself, Sire. Despite the suffering that your fratricidal struggle inflicts upon our country. you will not succeed in perverting public opinion ; you may try every avenue of publicity, but you will only find fickle partisans and doubtful friends of freedom. We have seen them at work, we know their record ; they like your despotism, not that they uphold slavery, for its name frightens them ; they would condemn the property and glorify the owner.

With such as these there can be no discussion ; they are known and refuted. There are, however, in the ranks of the French press, partisans of liberty like ourselves, who think themselves able to defend what they call the principle of secession without offence to liberty. They say honestly that, with ourselves, they reject slavery in principle—with this addition, that the American republic is not a State, that it is a juxta-position of States, each of which has the right to withdraw from the Union and take its star from the flag.

The American republic not a State ! Verily, we must be asleep with our eyes open. According to this, Holland also was not a state in the seventeenth century ! Then Switzerland too, is not a nation at this hour of her history ; and when General Dufour crushed the Sonderbund insurrection, he committed in reality the same crime that Catherine was guilty of toward Poland !

What ! The North and the South of America one memorable day in the last century by common consent threw off the supremacy of the mother country, to enjoy it entirely in common ; they voted a federal constitution in common ; they built a federal capitol in common, where they instal and organize a federal legislative system in common and a federal presidency, a federal administration, a federal diplomacy, a federal army and navy, a federal mint, and later jointly also, they bought Louisiana from France and Florida from Spain with federal money, and again out of federal funds they armed forts and built arsenals for the universal defence of all their frontiers, and yet they are not a State, nor even a nation, but simply a handful of dust vhich the first gust of wind may disperse !

Read the constitution over again ! There you will see that the thirteen original states entered into a solemn agreement each one with the other, to form always one single national body. As long as the South held a majority in the republic, (and as a consequence of such majority the monopoly of the presidency, and with the presidency the disposal of the federal offices, a welcome gift for distribution among their party leaders) they never dreamed, that I know, of disputing the sacredness of the contract, or of contesting the legitimacy of a power which they monopolized for their advantage, and enjoyed among themselves.

And now that luck is against them, when they are in a minority, when it is the turn of the North to hold the presidency, after legally gaining it, the South complains of overbearing. They held the place long but now they are told to leave and make room for another. The grandee's honor is insulted : he puts on his hat and leaves in a rage, nothing but a duel to the death can avenge the affront.

X.

Since when has it been optional with one party to an agreement to annul the contract without the consent of the other party? A contract is entered into precisely in order to prevent such a contingency. Otherwise there would never be any treaty in the world and man's hand-writing would be but a writing upon sand. The fate of the world would be continually dependent upon the peculiar system of pitch and toss called military science.

Why was the thing called a constitution thought of, unless in order to prevent what the South is doing at this moment. Every nation, even when self-styled one and indivisible, must always run the risk of domestic quarrels; and there are but two means to decide the difference, war or the ballot box.

When war is resorted to the stronger crushes down the weaker until the latter rises up and crushes the conqueror in his turn—and thus war begets war without end, until the country after tearing itself to pieces with its own hands, expires in a convulsion of anarchy and disappears in a conquest.

If it is to be settled by the constitution, then, instead of appealing to the sword the verdict of public opinion will be sought: the struggle will be definitively settled by suffrage. The minority will respectfully agree to the decision of the majority as the expression of justice. This is a simple fiction for the benefit of the common weal, implying no irrevocable decree, for, according to the constitution itself, the minority always possess the right of reconsidering the subject before the people when what is lacking may be recovered.

Hitherto this has been the great rule in politics. But the South thought fit to make an exception. They willingly approved the ballot box when it gave them a majority, but when they found themselves in a minority they took up the musket. We must certainly admit the right to revolt or else proclaim the inviolability of tyranny, but recourse to force can never rank as a system. It can only be resorted to as a forlorn hope, and there must exist the sacred incentive of freedom to be gained in order to justify an upright man in assuming the tragical responsibility of a revolution.

But when all the advantages of liberty are combined, when a people are thus above public opinion, and with every means of redress at hand, what right can they hope to obtain by victory which they do not already possess? One of the best and most deserving features of the American Constitution is that it lends no species of plea for insurrection. Why, for instance, should the people of Illinois declare war against the Union, when the Union oppresses liberty in no section, but on the contrary everywhere guarantees it.

And yet, Sire, you have unsheathed the sword, and why? Had the negro race not been in existence you would not have dreamed of rebelling, for your rebellion will not give you a single additional right or guarantee. You have revolted for one object only, the maintenance of slavery. Hitherto nations have rebelled for liberty alone. Your subjects, Sire, will be the first that have risen to support despotism.

Your keep up your rebellion by means worthy of its origin. I do not allude to the reign of terror that you have created at home in order to stifle the murmurings of the loyal partisans of the Union who still look wistfully in the direction of their common home. Nor will I refer to the terrible cannibalism which a certain young Belgian *savant* has depicted in all its

terrible truthfulness. You have closed the door upon us, Sire, and hidden yourself from our sight. You are modest regarding your handiwork, leaving its perfections to be inferred rather than admired.

I speak only of your open and avowed acts; of your barbarous proclamations unworthy of Ghengis-Kan in which you condemned Union Generals and negro soldiers to the halter. And this is not merely a threat, for you have already carried the sentence into effect. Still you had a scruple; you might have simply hanged your black prisoners; but you preferred to shoot them. This is shorter and more honorable. Sire, your conduct is horrible.

After this what can it serve to mention the Alabama, a corsair that plunders and then sinks every merchant vessel in her path, brazenly violating the first law of privateering, for even privateering has its laws. We note this, Sire, and we see by your conduct that you are really the pirate king that rumor terms you. By your present acts we see that you need hypocrisy in order to wheedle some European power into an alliance. We can foresee to what extent you would carry your filibustering if victory could obliterate your revolt. You lay down the mask too soon, Sire. I despise you, for you lack sense.

XI.

I know that there are men among us who feel a natural antipathy to the Yankee race. How can they like a people who never laugh and hardly smile, who speak but little and meditate eternally? What merit can be granted to a morose race who have, up to the present, failed to produce an actress or a milliner of any note, or even a racy specimen of their literature? They chew, smoke, and spit, and sit with their heels on the mantel-piece. How disgusting a spectacle to the goddess of liberty. At the theatre when they ought to hiss they applaud, and when they should applaud they hiss. Is not this turning the world upside down? You will soon see them wearing white mourning like the Chinese. And how about this democratic equality where one has but one seat in a steamboat or railroad car, where the millionaire must sit side by side with his bootblack! A certain French lady, tolerably well known in print, even goes so far as to affirm that the Yankee sleeps with his boots on. Pray how do you know, madam? Did you look under the counterpane?

The Yankee, I admit, possesses the defect of being a meditative man. He is as taciturn as the Western wilderness. He does not slap you on the shoulder at the first meeting; he does not jump into familiarity at the second; he does not borrow a dollar or your wife the third time he sees you; but is this a fair reason why one should set one'sself against right, because the Yankee happens to represent right, dry and unadorned. And is it not an evidence of being prejudiced against right when you place the North and the South on a footing of equality? Peace is desirable in the interest of humanity, we are told. Undoubtedly it is to be desired; but how is it to be obtained?

Can it be secured by recognizing the schism of the South as a perfected act, and by advising the North to accept this basis? This view of the question would encourage the South to continue the war; it would lead them to believe that they were secretly supported by some great European nation; and further, it would be an unmerited blow to the North, legalizing rebellion by I know not what sort of diplomatic chicanery.

When an established government permits foreign intervention between the constitution which it should defend, and a portion of its people in rebellion against this constitution, it does not negociate ; it resigns its rights as England would have done had she accepted the mediation of Austria at the time of Edward's expedition in Scotland. But the North, irritated and humiliated as they are by the results hitherto of this traitorous war, self-confident aud firm in their sense of right, will spend ten years of heroic fighting and ten thousand millions of money, before they will consent to forfeit these rights, or admit that they are in any degree in the wrong.

If a speedy peace is wished for, the South must be placed beyond the pale of public opinion. A moral blockade is necessary. One must turn aside and say, I do not know you ; you may win battles and shoot negroes, you may burn defenceless vessels, you may be able to accomplish all of which unbridled force is capable: you may do all this, but you cannot enlist the sympathies of a single honest man in Europe.

This state of "coventry" would have checked the arrogance of the South, and reacted upon the popular mind in the long run. The secret opposition of a portion of the Southern people would gradually have grown in strength, and finally the majority would have comprehended that they were the main stay of this terrible tragedy. A war for what object? To maintain slavery for the benefit of one hundred thousand planters, deeply indebted and mortgaged to the North, and who find it convenient at present to pay their debts with musket balls.

The South cannot conquer. They have gained temporary advantages, but at this moment their armies are harmless and hemmed in beyond the possibility of escape. The South has to face a terrible enemy, one that strikes incessantly, and destroys them in detail. This enemy is Time. Every day exhausts them more and more. They are only able to carry on the war now, by conscription and paper money ; they have no longer any revenue or products, and the grass grows in more than one city in your kingdom.

The abolition of slavery has given the rebellion its death-blow. The Southerners may point a pistol at the heart of every negro ; but the sacred leaven of liberty will act—with greater or less rapidity, doubtless—yet it is destined in one way or another to work upon the minds of the enslaved race, and at this moment more than one negro is thinking of the northern bank of the Potomac, with his ear to the earth to catch the sound of the Federal artillery.

And as an opportunity now offers, I crave leave to render my homage to the patient genius of Mr. Lincoln. In France we have an incurable passion for theatrical effect in politics : we deem it fashionable to sneer at the energetic slowness of the Yankee President. Being unable, with our Gallic temperament, to comprehend those phlematic natures, that grow greater under defeat than victory—like Coligny or William of Orange—we ask of ourselves why Mr. Lincoln signed the emancipation bill with two clauses, the one decreeing the immediate, and the other the prospective abolition of slavery.

We reason as though Mr. Lincoln wielded a dictatorial, unrestricted power at the White House, accounting solely to the God of his conscience. But Mr. Lincoln simply presides over a republic where popular opinion rules, and he is surrounded by divers opinions upon the question of slavery. The democratic party wish to uphold it, and the republicans desire to abolish it, therefore Mr. Lincoln waits, with an eye fixed upon each side

cale

XII.

No one knows better than Mr. Lincoln how to utilize defeat. When, by a bold victory, the South provoked the North to recognize the necessity of emancipation, Mr. Lincoln at once yielded and made a step forward. And in like manner, after the disaster at Chæronea, the Lincoln of Athens, did away with slavery, and when a slave thanked him he answered, you owe your freedom not to me but to Chæronea. I borrow this historical incident from Mr. Agénor de Gasparin's eloquent work.

I have faith in Lincoln, I believe in the old rail-splitter. At this moment he holds a world in his hand, and I hope that he will not let it fall ; but impossible as it seems, if, at some future day the North should mistrust itself and regret the old state of affairs in the past, what could such an act of weakness effect ? The artery once opened, its tide could be arrested for an instant only.

I will even admit the hypothesis that the North may confess its powerlessness and say to the slave-whippers, to the rag-pickers of the Constitution, who have thrown it into their basket as though it were an old rag, I am wrong, and I am sorry. Let us call our witnesses and amicably establish our respective frontiers.

But where will you place the boundary? Perhaps you will lay it down along the line of the Potomac, a line so often won and lost, and watered with human blood, or by the long trail of the five hundred thousand corpses of what were once fathers, sons, brothers, men loving and beloved, who lie rotting now because the gentlemen of South Carolina thought fit one day to commit a double crime ; a crime against humanity and a crime against their country.

You will set your stakes across this cemetery, above the almost uncovered bones mouldering there ; but sink them as deep as you may, they will not hold. You will sign a peace, but you will not have it ; for beneath the very feet of the plenipotentiaries this tragic soil, choked with dead, will yawn and open to yield up the spectres of the Bull Run victims. In the absence of the living, the dead will rise to protest against this embrace between the agressive South and the victimized North.

And think you that a few signatures written down side by side on a sheet of paper, will suffice to efface the recollection of this terrible slaughter. No, these reminiscences will remain written upon men's hearts in letters of fire and blood, and the widows in the most distant villages of the West will water them with their tears by their firesides and at their work.

North and South, you will ever regard each other with an angry eye. At the first opportunity you will break out again ; there will be another slaughter-house on the face of the earth, and the new world will have nothing to envy the old. Henceforward you must go armed and each keep up an army of four hundred thousand soldiers. You will attempt to avoid a momentary expense by a patched-up peace and before the end of the century your national debt will have reached two hundred or three hundred thousand millions. This is the ordinary cost of an army during one generation. If you doubt it inquire of Austria.

The day that a permanent army shall exist in North America, you may bid adieu to liberty, as it has been accepted and practised hitherto. With the danger of foreign war will come the doctrine of public safety, and governments will be made et unmade with the bayonet, as in Buenos-Ayres. I cannot see how the commerce of Europe is to profite by this.

XIII.

Should Europe, however, entertain the unfortunate idea of creating with her own hand, in the Gulf of Mexico, a cotton republic, a black state founded upon slavery, such a rash act would inflict upon the world an element of perturbation and a scourge more terrible than the cholera. One master of its own movements, this pro-slavery goverment, this despicable and accursed political monstrosity, repulsive to the entire world, would speedily bid defiance to everything, aggravating in order to diminish the horror of its crime, and would become so powerful that it would finally command respect.

It would not be as in the past a disgraceful underhand attack upon Texas or Cuba; it would be piracy exercised on a grand scale in order to render slavery universal. The slave trade would be carried on for reasons of state, and carried on in a royal manner by squadrons of vessels. From that day the negro would eternally wear the mourning of civilization upon his brow.

But, whatever may happen, I hope that France, the offspring of revolution, will never lend a hand to such an anachronism, and one so inconsistent with her past history; did not the French revolution inaugurate negro emancipation and first grant the black the right of citizenship? And as one reminiscence calls up others, I beg leave to mention here an incident of the present time, although it is already so distant that it seems like the past.

It was in February. Revolution was everywhere at work, and throughout Europe every instant a fresh explosion announced the fall of another kingdom. All Paris was on foot; the streets were alive; and clouds of smoke floated in the air. The wind was laden with words as though an invisible spirit spoke in the mist. The crowd marched restlessly and excitedly from street to street with colors flying and drums beating, parading their chimera and their hope; their truth or their dream.

But above this agitated, swaying sea of humanity, above its uproar and tumult, in the calm region of high inspirations and sacred desires, the new republic, serene and holy, looked mentally beyond the sea. Full of the love of human dignity and everywhere present where there was a wound to heal, the new republic drew up the decree abolishing slavery, and the eleven members of the provisional government signed it. When the last signer laid down his pen they threw themselves into each other's arms and embraced with all the joy of the workmen of humanity after doing a good act.

Ah! the men, whoever they were, who signed that decree may be forgotten now, but their short term of power was not spent in vain. Had a king signed it, such a decree would have sufficed to make his reign glorious. The provisional government were not even allowed the credit of it. Serve humanity and such will be your reward! But the good was accomplished and it remains. The divine spirit has also its day in our country, and if this day is drawing to its close, there are at least others beyond the ocean to whom the last revolution has given the right to shout for Liberty!

This, Sire, is what I had to say to Your Majesty. I have finished; but let me give you a parting word of advice. I will not appeal to your heart, for that would be speaking to the absent: I will appeal simply to your interests, then I may have some chance of fixing your attention.

Believe me and tempt destiny no longer. Remember the example of the French nobility. They left the soil rather than submit to common law, and the soil passed from them into the hands of a class sprung from revolution and identified with liberty. Since that day the French nation has formed one family. I leave you to meditate, Sire, upon this lesson of history.

How many vassals have you in reality? Scarcely a hundred thousand. These alone are guilty of the insurrection. All that will be necessary will be to turn their plantations into money and introduce the population of the West into this regenerated section. This is the way to solve the slavery question and effect the reconciliation of the South. And now, Sire, I pray God to have you in his keeping, to correct you and incline you toward repentance. Amend, Sire, otherwise one may soon see in Paris a ragged old man asking the police for a passport in order to follow the Duke of Modena to Venice. That old man will be King Cotton.

Messager Franco-Américain Printing Office, 51, Liberty street, New-York.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY.
No. 13.
Published by ANSON D. F. RANDOLPH, 683 Broadway, corner of Amity Street, New-York.

HOW A FREE PEOPLE CONDUCT A LONG WAR.

BY CHARLES J. STILLÉ.

We have known hitherto in this country so little of the actual realities of war on a grand scale, that many are beginning to look upon the violent opposition to the Government, and the slowness of the progress of our arms, as signs of hopeless discouragement. History, however, shows us that these are the inevitable incidents of all wars waged by a free people. This might be abundantly illustrated by many remarkable events in English history, from the days of the great Rebellion, down through the campaigns of the Prince of Orange and of Marlborough, to the wars which grew out of the events of the French Revolution. War is always entered upon amidst a vast deal of popular enthusiasm, which is utterly unreasoning. It is the universal voice of history, that such enthusiasm is wholly unreliable in supporting the prolonged and manifold burdens which are inseparable from every war waged on an extensive scale, and for a long period. The popular idea of war is a speedy and decisive victory and an immediate occupation of the enemy's capital, followed by a treaty of peace by which the objects of the war are permanently secured. Nothing is revealed to the excited passions of the multitude but dazzling visions of national glory, purchased by small privations, and the early and complete subjugation of their enemies. It is, therefore, not unnatural that at the first reverse they should yield at once to an unmanly depression, and, giving up all for lost, they should vent upon the Government for its conduct of the war, and upon the army and its generals for their failure to make their dreams of victory realities, an abuse as unreasoning as was their original enthusiasm.

Experience has taught the English people that the progress of a war never fulfils the popular expectations; that although victory may be assured at last to patient and untiring vigor and energy in its prosecution, yet during the continuance of a long war, there can be no well-founded hope of a uniform and constant series of brilliant triumphs in the field, illustrating the profound wisdom of the policy of the Cabinet; that, on the contrary, all war, even that which is most successful in the end, consists rather in checkered fortunes, of alternations of victory and disaster, and that its con

duct is generally marked by what were evidently, when viewed in the light of experience, blunders so glaring in the policy adopted by the Government, or in the strategy of its generals, that the wonder is success was achieved at all. The English have thus been taught that the true characteristic of public opinion, in its judgment of a war, should be, not so much hopefulness or impatience of immediate results, but rather a stern endurance — that King-quality of heroic constancy which, rooted deep in a profound conviction of the justice of the cause, supports a lofty public spirit equally well in the midst of temporary disaster, and in the hour of assured triumph.

We have had no such experience here. Our people are perhaps more easily excited by success, and more readily depressed by reverses, than the English, and it is, therefore, worth while to consider how they carried on war on a large scale and for a protracted period. It will be found, if we mistake not, that the denunciations of the Government, so common among us of late, and the complaints of the inactivity of the army, have their exact counterpart in the history of the progress of all the wars in which England has been engaged since the days of the great Rebellion. He who draws consolation from the lessons of the past, will not, we think, seek comfort in vain when he discovers that in all those wars in which the Government and the army have been so bitterly assailed, (except that of the American Revolution,) England has at last been triumphant. It is worth while, then, to look into English history to understand how war is successfully carried on, notwithstanding the obstacles which, owing to a perverted public opinion, exist within the nation itself. These difficulties, although they inhere in the very nature of a free government, often prove, as we shall see, more fruitful of embarrassment to the favorable prosecution of a war than the active operations of the enemy.

We propose to illustrate the propositions which we have advanced, by a study of the series of campaigns known in English history as the Peninsular War. We select this particular war because we think that in many of its events, and in the policy which sustained it, there are to be observed many important, almost startling, parallelisms with our present struggle. We have, of course, no reference to any similarity existing in the principle which produced the two wars, but rather to the striking resemblance in the modes adopted by the two people for prosecuting war on a grand scale, and for the vindication of a principle regarded as of vital importance by them.

The Peninsular War, on the part of England, as was contended by the ministry during its progress, and as is now universally recognized, was a struggle not only to maintain her commercial supremacy, (which was then, as it is now, her life,) but also to protect her own soil from invasion by the French, by transferring the scene of conflict to distant Spain. The general purpose of assisting the alliance against Napoleon seems always to have been a subordinate motive. It is now admitted by all historians, that upon success in this war depended not only England's rank among nations, but her very existence as an independent people. The war was carried on for more than five years, and on a scale, so far as the number of men and the extent of the military operations are concerned, until then wholly unattempted by England in her European wars. The result, as it need not be said, was not only to crown the British arms with the most brilliant and

undying lustre, but also to retain permanently in their places the party whose only title to public favor was that they had carried on the war against the most serious obstacles, and brought it to a successful termination. Thus was delayed, it may be remarked, for at least twenty years, the adoption of those measures of reform which at last gave to England that place in modern civilization which had long before been reached by most of the nations of the Continent, by passing through the trials of a bloody revolution. If we, then, in our dark hours, are inclined to doubt and despondency as to the final result, let us not forget the ordeal through which England successfully passed. We shall find that, in the commencement, there was the same wild and unreasoning enthusiasm with which we are familiar; the same bitter abuse and denunciation of the Government at the first reverses; the same impatient and ignorant criticism of military operations; the same factious and disloyal opposition on the part of a powerful party; the same discouragement and despondency at times on the part of the true and loyal; the same prophecies of the utter hopelessness of success; the same complaints of grievous and burdensome taxation, and predictions of the utter financial ruin of the country; the same violent attacks upon the Government for its arbitrary decrees, and particularly for the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus;* the same difficulties arising from the inexperience of the army; and the same weakness on the part of the Government in not boldly and energetically supporting the army in the field. These are some of the more striking parallelisms between the Peninsular War and our own struggle, which a slight sketch of the progress of that war will render very apparent.

The insurrection in Spain which followed immediately upon a knowledge of the intrigues of Napoleon at Bayonne, in April, 1807, by which the royal family was entrapped into an abdication of its rights to the throne, and Joseph Bonaparte made king of that country, roused universal admiration and enthusiasm in England. It was thought by all parties that an obstacle to the further progress of Napoleon's schemes of the most formidable character had at last been found. It was the first popular insurrection in any country against Napoleon's power, and consequently, when the deputies from the Asturias reached England imploring succor, their appeals excited the popular feeling to the highest pitch, and the opposite parties in Parliament and the country vied with each other in demanding that England should aid the insurrection with the whole of her military power. It is curious to observe, that when the question of aid was brought before Parliament, Mr. Canning and Mr. Sheridan, who had probably never acted together before on any political question, rivalled each other in their praise of the Spaniards, and in their expressions of hope and belief that Napoleon had at last taken a step which would speedily prove fatal to him. Large supplies were voted by acclamation, and an important expedition, afterwards operating in two columns, one under the command of Sir John Moore, the other under that of Sir Arthur Wellesley, was dispatched to the Peninsula to aid the insurgents. It is not our purpose to trace the progress of this expedition, but merely to notice the effect which its immediate results, the retreat to Corunna and the Convention of Cintra, produced upon popular feeling in England. As we look back on the history of that time, the folly

and madness which seized upon the popular mind when the terms of the Convention of Cintra became known, can only be explained by recalling the high-wrought and extravagant expectations of immediate success with which the war had been entered upon. By this Convention, and as the results of a single battle, Portugal was wholly evacuated by the French; yet such were the unreasonable demands of public opinion, that because the whole French army had not been made prisoners of war, the Ministry was almost swept away by the outburst, and it could only control the storm by removing the two generals highest in rank. It required all the family and political influence of the third, Sir Arthur Wellesley, to enable him to retain his position in the army. The disastrous retreat of Sir John Moore's army to Corunna, and the easy triumphs of the French at that period throughout all Spain, plunged the English into despair. Going from one extreme to another, men who, only three months before, had quarreled with the army in Portugal because it had not given them the spectacle of a French marshal and twenty thousand of his soldiers as prisoners of war at Spithead, now spoke openly of the folly of any attempt at all on the part of the English to resist the progress of the French arms in the Peninsula. In Parliament there was the usual lame apology for disaster, an attempt to shift the responsibility from the Ministry to the General in command; but the great fact, that all their hopes had been disappointed still remained, and after the explanations of the Government the general despondency became more gloomy than ever. It is not difficult in the light of history to see where the blame of failure should rest. Any one who is disposed now to sneer and cavil at the shortcomings of our own administration, to impute to it views short-sighted and impracticable in their policy, and to blame it for want of energy and vigor in the prosecution of the war, has only to turn to Colonel Napier's account of the stupid blunders of the English Government, its absurd and contradictory orders, its absolute ignorance not only of the elementary principles of all war, but of the very nature of the country in which the army was to operate, and of the resources of the enemy, to be convinced that had its mode of carrying on hostilities (which was the popular one) been adopted, in six months not an English soldier would have remained in the Peninsula except as a prisoner of war. The history of this campaign contains important lessons for us; it shows conclusively that the immediate results of war are never equal to the public expectation, and that if this public expectation, defeated by the imbecility of the Government, or soured by disaster in the field, is to be the sole rule by which military operations are to be judged, no war for the defense of a principle can long be carried on.

Fortunately for the fame and the power of England, the Ministry, although ignorant of the true mode of prosecuting hostilities, had sense enough to perceive that their only true policy was perseverance. They were strong enough to resist the formidable opposition which the events we have referred to developed in Parliament and the country, and, undismayed by the experience of the past, concluded a treaty with the Provisional Government of Spain, by which they pledged England never to abandon the national cause until the French were driven across the Pyrenees. The army was placed upon a better footing, was largely reënforced, and Sir

Arthur Wellesley was appointed to the chief command. The Government, not yet wholly awakened from its illusions, still thought it practicable to reach Madrid in a single campaign, and to that end the efforts of Wellington were directed. It became necessary first to dislodge Soult at Oporto, and the magnificent victory of the English, gained by the passage of the Douro at that point, went far to revive confidence at home in the invincibility of their army. Yet so clear is it that victory in war often depends upon what, for some better name, we may call mere good fortune, that we have the authority of the Duke of Wellington himself for saying, that this army, which had just exhibited such prodigies of valor, was then in such a state of demoralization, that although "excellent on parade, excellent to fight, it was worse than an enemy in a country, and liable to dissolution alike by success or defeat." Certainly no severer criticism has ever been justified by the inexperience and want of discipline of our own raw levies than that contained in this memorable declaration. A little reflection and candor might teach us, as it did the English, that nothing can compensate for the want of experience, and that every allowance is to be made for disasters where it is necessary to educate both officers and soldiers in the actual presence of the enemy. Wellington soon afterwards moved towards the Spanish frontier, hoping by a junction with the army under Cuesta to fight a battle with the French, which would open to him the road to the capital. The battle was fought at Talavera, and although it has since been claimed by the English as one of their proudest victories, and the name of Talavera is now inscribed upon the standards of the regiments who took part in it with those of Salamanca and Vittoria, yet the result was in the end, that Wellington was obliged to retreat to Lisbon, just three months after he had set out from that place, having left his wounded in the hands of the French, having escaped as if by a miracle from being wholly cut off in his retreat, and having lost one third of his army in battle and by disease. Of course, the blame was thrown upon the want of coöperation on the part of the Spaniards. This we have nothing to do with; it is the result of the campaign with which we are concerned. Dependence upon the Spaniards was certainly, as it turned out, a fault, but it was one of the fair chances of war, and it was a fault in which Wellington, made wise by experience, was never again detected.

When the news of the untoward result of this campaign reached England, the clamor against the Government and against Wellington was quite as violent as that excited by the disasters of Sir John Moore's army. The opposition in Parliament took advantage of this feeling to rouse public opinion to such a manifestation as might compel the termination of the war in the Peninsula, and drive the ministry from office. The Common Council of London, probably a fair exponent of the opinions of the middle class, petitioned the King not to confirm the grant of £2000 year, which the Ministry had succeeded in getting Parliament to vote to Wellington. The petitioners ridiculed the idea that a battle attended with such results should be called a victory. "It should rather be called a *calamity*," they said, "since we were obliged to seek safety in a precipitate flight, abandoning many thousands of our wounded countrymen into the hands of the French." In the opinion of the strategists in the Common Council and of their friends in

Parliament, Wellington might be a brave officer, but he was no general; he had neglected the protection of his flanks and his line of communication. When it is remembered, that at this very time, Wellington, profiting by the experience of the past, was diligently making his army really effective within the lines of Torres Vedras, from which stronghold it was in due time to sally forth like a giant refreshed, never to rest until it had planted the English flag on the heights of Toulouse, we may perhaps smile at the presumption of those who, sincere well-wishers to the cause, displayed only their ignorance in their criticism. But what shall be said of those who, knowing better, being quite able to understand the wisdom of the policy adopted by the General to insure success in the stupendous enterprise in which the country was engaged, yet with a factious spirit, and with the sole object of getting into power themselves, took advantage of the excitement of the ignorant multitude to paralyze the energies of the Government?

That hideous moral leprosy, which seems to be the sad but invariable attendant upon all political discussions in a free government, corrupting the very sources of public life, breeding only the base spirit of faction, had taken complete possession of the opposition, and in its sordid calculations, the dishonor of the country, or the danger of the army, was as nothing provided the office, the power, and the patronage of the Government were secured in their hands. It was of little concern to them, provided they could drive the Ministry from office, whether its downfall was brought about by blunders in Spain, or by the King's obstinacy about Catholic Emancipation, or by an obscure quarrel about the influence of the Lords of the bed-chamber. The sincerity of these declamations of the opposition was curiously enough put to the test some time afterwards, when the Ministry, wearied by the factious demagogueism with which all their measures were assailed, and understanding perfectly their significance, boldly challenged their opponents, if they were in earnest, to make a definite motion in the House of Commons, that Portugal should be abandoned to its fate. This move completely unmasked their game, and for a time silenced the clamor, for it was perfectly understood on all hands, that deep in the popular heart, undisturbed by the storms which swept over its surface, there was a thorough and abiding conviction of the absolute necessity of resisting the progress of Napoleon's arms, and that the real safety of England herself required that that resistance should then be made in Spain. Still this noisy clamor did immense mischief; it weakened the Government, it prolonged the strife, it alarmed the timid, it discouraged the true, and it so far imposed upon Napoleon himself, that thinking that in these angry invectives against the Government he found the real exponent of English sentiment, he concluded, not unnaturally, that the people were tired and disgusted with the war, and that the privations which it occasioned were like a cancer, slowly but surely eating out the sources of national life.

In the midst of these violent tumults at home, Wellington was silently preparing for his great work within the lines of Torres Vedras. It would not be easy to overrate the difficulties by which he was surrounded. He was fully aware of the outcry which had been raised against him; he knew that from a Cabinet weakened by internal dissensions, and on the verge of overthrow from the vigorous assaults of the opposition, and from its own

unpopularity occasioned by the failure of the Walcheren expedition, and the disasters in the Peninsula, he could expect no thorough and reliable support. Indeed, the Government, almost in despair, threw the whole responsibility for the military measures on the Continent on him alone. He accepted the responsibility in a most magnanimous spirit. "I conceive," he writes, "that the honor and the interests of the country require that we should hold our position here as long as possible, and please God, I will maintain it as long as I can. I will neither endeavor to shift from my own shoulders on those of the Ministers the responsibility for the failure, by calling for means which I know they can not give, and which perhaps would not add materially to the facility of attaining our object; nor will I give to the Ministers, who are not strong, and who must feel the delicacy of their own situation, an excuse for withdrawing the army from a position which, in my opinion, the honor and interest of the country require they should maintain as long as possible." Animated by this heroic sense of duty, the Commander-in-Chief prepared to contend against the 200,000 men under Massena, whom Napoleon had sent to chase him into the sea. He had, to oppose this immense force, only 25,000 English soldiers, and about the same number of Portuguese, tolerably organized. Secure within the lines of Torres Vedras, he quietly waited until the want of provisions, and the utter hopelessness of an assault upon his position forced upon Massena the necessity of retreating. Then instantly pursuing, in a series of battles, of almost daily occurrence, he drove Massena out of Portugal, and reached once more the Spanish frontier in May, 1811, nearly three years after the English had sent an army to the assistance of the Peninsula. Here he rested for a long time, making preparations for the siege of Badajoz and Ciudad Rodrigo, operations requiring time, and the success of which was essential to the safety of the army in its further progress. Still, so little was Wellington's position, military and political, understood in England, even at that time, after all the proofs he had given of consummate ability, that public clamor was again roused against the mode adopted by him for conducting the war. As there were no disasters at which to grumble, people talked of "barren victories," because like those of Crecy and Azincourt, they brought no territorial acquisitions, forgetting then what they have never been weary of boastingly proclaiming since, that these victories were the best proofs that their army was distinguished by the highest military qualities, which, properly directed and supported, were capable of achieving the most glorious results. So profound was the conviction of the immense superiority of the French, both in numbers and in the quality of their troops, that the public mind was in a state of feverish anxiety, and many of the stoutest hearts gave way to despair. About this period Sir Walter Scott wrote to Mr. Ellis: "These cursed, double cursed news (from Spain) have sunk my spirits so much, that I am almost at disbelieving a Providence; God forgive me, but I think some evil demon has been permitted in the shape of this tyrannical monster, whom God has sent on the nations visited in his anger. The spring-tide may, for aught I know, break upon *us* in the next session of Parliament. There is an evil fate upon us in all we do at home or abroad." So Sir James Mackintosh, writing to Gentz, at Vienna: "I believe, like you, in a resurrection, because I believe

in the immortality of civilization, but when, and by whom, and in what form, are questions which I have not the sagacity to answer, and on which it would be boldness to hazard a conjecture. A dark and stormy night, a black series of ages may be prepared for our posterity, before the dawn that opens the more perfect day. Who can tell how long that fearful night may be before the dawn of a brighter morrow? The race of man may reach the promised land; but there is no assurance that the present generation will not perish in the wilderness." As if to render the situation more gloomy, if possible, the Marquis of Wellesley, the brother of Wellington, left the Ministry upon the avowed ground that the Government would not support the war with sufficient vigor. History has stripped his conduct of any such worthy motive, and shown that the real trouble was his anxiety to supplant Mr. Perceval. At the same time, the attack was kept up in the opposite quarter. "No man in his senses," says Sir Francis Burdett, "could entertain a hope of the final success of our arms in the Peninsula. Our laurels were great, but barren, and our victories in their effects mere defeats." Mr. Whitbread, too, as usual, was not behindhand with his prophecies. "He saw no reason," he said, "to alter his views respecting peace; war must otherwise terminate in the subjugation of either of the contending powers. They were both great; but this was a country of factitious greatness. France was a country of natural greatness." So, General Tarleton "had the doctrine of Mr. Fox in his favor, who wished for the pencil of a Cervantes to be able to ridicule those who desired to enter upon a continental war." *

Thus, from universal enthusiasm in favor of the Spanish war, public opinion, at first manifesting itself through the factious spirit of the opposition, at length spoke through all its organs, in tones of despondency and despair, of the situation and prospects of the country, and simply because there had not been that sort of military success which it could understand, to sustain and direct it. Universal distrust seized upon the public mind;

* The following description of the opposition of that day, taken from the *Annual Register* for 1812, bears so striking a likeness to the peculiarities of the leaders of an insignificant, but restless faction among us, that, omitting the old-fashioned drapery of the proper names, they seem to have sat for the photograph. "It may be remarked as a most singular circumstance, that those persons in this country who profess to have the greatest abhorrence of ministerial tyranny and oppression, look with the utmost coolness on the tyranny and oppression of Bonaparte. The regular opposition do not mention it with that abhorrence which might be expected from them; but the leaders of the popular party in Parliament go further. They are almost always ready to find an excuse for the conduct of Bonaparte. The most violent and unjustifiable acts of his tyranny raise but feeble indignation in their minds, while the most trifling act of ministerial oppression is inveighed against with the utmost bitterness. Ready and unsuspecting credence is given to every account of Bonaparte's success; while the accounts of the success of his opponents are received with coldness and distrust. Were it not for these things, the conduct of Mr. Whitbread and his friends would be hailed with more satisfaction, and inspire more confidence with the real lovers of their country; for they deserve ample credit for the undaunted and unwearied firmness with which they have set themselves against abuses and against every instance of oppression."

and had it not been for the heroic constancy of that great commander, whose task in supporting the Ministry at home was at least as difficult as that of beating the French in Spain, the glory of England had sunk forever.

Yet it happened, as it so often happens in the order of Divine Providence, in the moral as in the physical world, that the night was darkest just before dawn. Amidst all this universal despondency and sinister foreboding, events were preparing which in a few short months changed the whole face of Europe, and forced back that torrent of revolutionary success which had spread over the whole continent, until it overwhelmed the country where it had its source in complete ruin. The discussions in Parliament to which we have referred, took place in February, 1812. With the siege of Ciudad Rodrigo on the 18th of January of that year, with the fall of Badajoz on the 26th of March, the first battle of Salamanca on the 20th of July, and Napoleon's invasion of Russia in June in the same year, began the downfall of the French Empire.

Wellington at last reached Madrid in August, 1812, more than four years later than he ought to have done, according to the strategists of Parliament and the Press. This was all forgotten at the moment, so magic a wand is held by success. The fickle voice of popular applause was again heard, echoing the spirit of confidence which his persistent and undaunted conduct had revived in the hearts of his countrymen. His career of victory, however, was destined not to be unchecked; and when, after his occupation of Madrid, his unsuccessful assault upon the Castle of Burgos rendered a retreat to the Portuguese frontier and the evacuation of the capital a proper military movement, although that retreat was compensated for by the abandonment of Andalusia by the French, in order to concentrate their whole force against him, still the blind multitude could not be made to understand it, and began again to murmur.

It is not now difficult to see that the victory at Salamanca was really what the far-seeing sagacity of Marshal Soult predicted at the time it would become, "a prodigious historical event," that it was the pivot on which at that time hinged the destinies of England, one of those battles of which we see perhaps a dozen only in the whole course of history, which are really decisive of the fate of empires. It completely unloosed the French power in the Peninsula, and prepared the way for the great success of Vittoria, the next year, which gave the *coup de grace* to the French military occupation of Spain. It is not our present purpose to trace the history of the next campaign, but it is curious to observe the effects produced by assured success upon that public opinion which had shifted so often and so strangely during the progress of this eventful struggle. The opposition, as their only hope of escape from political annihilation, and thinking to swim with the popular current, abused the ministers for not supporting Wellington with sufficient earnestness, complaining that they had taken the advice which they themselves had so often and so eloquently tendered. But it was of no avail. This wretched charlatanism was too transparent to impose upon any one; and of the great party who opposed the war, no one ever after rose to office or power in England. It required a whole generation, in the opinion of the English constituencies, to expiate the faults of those who had sneered at the great Duke, and had called the glorious fields

of Vimeiro, Busaco, Talavera, Fuentes d'Onor, Ciudad Rodrigo, and Badajoz, names which had become associated with the proudest recollections of English renown, "mere barren victories, equal in their effects to defeats."

We pass now to the consideration of another class of difficulties inherent in the prosecution of every war, and generally of far greater magnitude than any other — those connected with the raising of the vast sums of money required for the support of military operations. In this important matter, if we mistake not, there are some striking points of resemblance between the English experience during the war and our present situation. It is the fashion among many who seek to excite the public alarm on this subject from unworthy, and sometimes, it may be feared, from treasonable motives, to represent the enormous outlay of the nation's wealth which is poured out to save the nation's life, as wholly unparalleled in history. Yet it may be asserted, without any fear of contradiction, that England, with a population then little more than half of that which now inhabits our loyal States, with resources infinitely less in proportion at that time than our own, her manufacturing industry, so far as external outlet was concerned, wholly crippled by the operation of the French continental system, and her own Orders in Council, expended, during every year of the Peninsular War, as large a sum as has been required here each year to create and keep up the gigantic force now in arms to put down the rebellion. During the five years that the war lasted, her average annual expenditure exceeded ninety millions of pounds sterling, or four hundred and fifty millions of dollars, which is about the same sum which is demanded of us. No one, of course, pretends to say that this rate of expenditure is not appalling, yet it concerns us to know that it is not unprecedented, and that these vast amounts have been raised from national resources far inferior to our own. It should not be forgotten, also, that they represent the money price of England's independence, and if ours is secured by a far greater outlay, we certainly are not disposed to quarrel with the wisdom of the investment.

The question is, how were these immense sums raised in England? The man who would have predicted, at the commencement of the war with France, that the English national debt would at its close exceed one thousand millions of pounds sterling, and that the country would be able to bear such a burden, would have been regarded as visionary, and as wild as he who in this country, two years ago, might have foretold the present amount of our national debt, and have contended that, in spite of it, the public credit would remain unimpaired. The difficulty in England of raising these vast sums was tenfold greater than it is here. Napoleon, looking upon England as the Southern people have been taught to regard us, as a purely commercial nation, undoubtedly placed more reliance for success upon the instinct of money-getting, which would shrink from the pecuniary sacrifices necessary in a prolonged struggle, than upon the mere victories of his army. Hence he pursued, during his whole career, an inflexible purpose of ruining English commerce, and by a series of measures known as the Continental system, endeavored to exclude English ships and English products from the markets of the world. The effect of these measures, although not so serious as he wished and had anticipated, nevertheless

crippled enormously the resources of England just at the period when they were most needed.

Taking the three years before the issuing of the Orders in Council, and the vigorous enforcement of the Continental system, which were coïncident in point of time with the commencement of the Spanish war, the average annual exports sank from fifty-seven millions to twenty-three millions, taking the average of three years after they had been in operation. Taxes were laid on at a most burdensome rate. The income tax was ten per cent, and besides, specific war taxes, amounting to more than twenty millions a year, were imposed. Notwithstanding all these taxes the debt increased more than one thousand millions of dollars during the Peninsular War. Discontent and violence among the laboring classes became universal, and it was remarked that the achievement of the greatest victories in Spain was celebrated in England "amidst a population who had been prevented by the burden of taxation on the absolute necessaries of life, from securing a livelihood by the strictest industry, and thus pauperism had been generated throughout the land, a pauperism aggravated by a spirit of pillage, which it required a strong military force to repress." Bankruptcy and ruin fell upon the trading classes, and absolute exhaustion of the resources of the country seemed almost reached. The public stocks had sunk to such a degree that the three per cents, which are now always above ninety per cent, were rarely higher during the war than sixty-five per cent, and so depressed at last had the public credit become, that the last loan of the Continental war, that of April, 1815, was taken by the contractor at fifty-three per cent, and paid for in the depreciated paper of the day; and yet the Chancellor of the Exchequer was congratulated even by the opposition for having made a "good operation." The Bank was in a state of chronic suspension, the buying and selling of gold were prohibited to the public under severe penalties, and yet every gold guinea which was sent by the government to the army in Spain (and nothing else would answer the purpose of money in that country) cost thirty per cent premium. How England survived all this complication of troubles is one of the marvels of history, but it is not our purpose to discuss that question. The great fact that the money required was somehow raised is all that we have to do with at present. When we have been at war for twenty years, and are forced, in order to raise the means of carrying it on, to submit to one tithe of the sacrifices which were endured by the English, we may then perhaps begin seriously to consider the money value of the Union.

The lesson which this review of the progress of the Peninsular War teaches, is, it seems to us, one of hope and encouragement, for if it shows any thing, it proves clearly that in the support of public opinion, and in the means requisite to maintain a great army, those fundamental essentials of real military success, our Government is immeasurably stronger than the English ever was at any period of the war. It teaches also another important lesson, and that is, that there is such a thing as public opinion falsely so called, which is noisy just in proportion as its real influence is narrow and restricted. One of the most difficult and delicate tasks of the statesman is to distinguish the true from this false opinion, the factious demagogue from the grumbling but sincere patriot, and to recognize with a ready

instinct the voice which comes from the depths of the great heart of the people, in warning it may be sometimes, in encouragement often, but always echoing its abiding faith in the ultimate triumph of the good cause.

We have confined ourselves in our illustrations to the discussion of questions as they affected the success of purely military operations, because we feel that *here* our grand business is to clear away the obstacles, real or fancied, which may in any way impair our military efficiency. In military success alone, we are firmly convinced, is to be found the true solution of our whole difficulty, the only force which can give vitality or permanence to any theory of settlement. As the matter now stands, it is idle to hope for either peace or safety until this question of military superiority is unmistakably and definitely settled. Upon this point, then, the increase of our military efficiency, which embraces not merely the improvement of the condition of the army, but also, as we have endeavored to show by English examples, and in a greater degree than is often supposed, the support of the Government in its general policy of conducting the war, should the efforts of all those who influence public opinion be concentrated.

There is a certain class of men among us, not very numerous, perhaps, but still, owing to their position and culture, of considerable influence, who, accustomed to find in the European armies their standard of military efficiency, are disposed to doubt whether a force, composed as ours is of totally different materials, can accomplish great results. We may admit at once the superiority of foreign military organization, the result of the traditions of centuries of military experience, digested into a thorough system, and carried out by long trained officers perfectly versed in the details of the service. Much inconvenience has necessarily resulted in our case from the ignorance of regimental officers, to a greater degree probably, however, from a want of proper care and attention on their part to the troops when in camp, than from any gross incompetency or misconduct on the field of battle. Instances of such misconduct there have undoubtedly been, but, considering the number of the officers and their want of experience, those instances are extremely rare, and when we call to mind the number of officers who have fallen, while leading their men in battle, out of proportion, as it undoubtedly is, with the losses in other wars, we may well palliate deficiencies in this respect, out of considerations for their heroic gallantry and devotion. We do not underrate certainly the value of good officers, but history tells us that great victories have been achieved by armies who were no better led than ours. The incompetency of his officers was one of Wellington's standing complaints in Spain. Most of them knew absolutely nothing beyond the mere routine of garrison duty; they were all what is technically called "gentlemen," for each one had purchased his commission at a high price, but they had had no systematic training in military schools; nearly all of them had had no actual experience of war, and their average intelligence was undoubtedly below that of the men who hold similar positions in our army.* All accounts

* We have no room to enumerate in detail the complaints made by the Duke of the officers of his army. Those who are interested in the subject may consult

agree that at that period the scientific branches of the great art of war were almost wholly neglected in the British army, and such was the happy ignorance of the elements of strategy, that at a court-martial composed of general officers for the trial of General Whitelock in 1808, for his failure at Buenos Ayres, it was necessary to explain to the court what was meant in military phrase by the "right bank" of a river.

It is said again, by those who have the standard of foreign armies before their eyes, that among our soldiers there is not a proper deference to rank, too much *camaraderie* in short, and that this is fatal to discipline. But it should be remembered that mere formal discipline may be one thing, and the true spirit of discipline another, and yet both may answer the same purpose. The first may be more showy than the latter, but not more valuable to real military efficiency. Every thing depends upon the character of the soldier who is to be governed by it. The British army is composed, as we all know, of the refuse of the population, and in the war in the Peninsula it was largely reënforced by the introduction into its ranks of convicts taken from the hulks, who were there expiating infamous offenses. With such men, motives based on a sense of duty were powerless. Drunkenness, theft, marauding, a mutinous spirit under privations, and a fierce thirst of license which defied all control in the hour of victory, these were the brutal passions which could only be checked by the equally brute hand of force. But from such a vile herd, made useful only as a slave is made useful, by fear of the lash, to the civilized, sober, well-educated American citizen, animated with the consciousness that he is fighting for a great cause, in the success of which he and his children have a deep personal interest, and who learns obedience because both his common-sense and his sense of duty recognize its necessity, how immeasurable is the distance! The American volunteer, in this respect, has not had justice done to his excellence. He is certainly a soldier essentially *sui generis*, and when we hear sneers at his want of discipline, let us remember that although he may not regard his officers as superior beings, yet experience has already shown that in the cheerful performance of his new duties under privations; in his freedom from those vices which in many minds are inseparably associated with the very idea of a soldier; in his courage, endurance, and steadiness in battle; and, more than all, in those higher qualities which are the fruit of his education, general intelligence, and love of country, he presents himself to us as a figure hitherto wholly unknown in military history.

Col. Gurwood's 4th volume, pages 343, 346, 352, 363, 385, 399, and 407. The whole story is summed up, however, in the general order occasioned by the disorderly retreat from Burgos, in which the Duke said "that discipline had deteriorated during the campaign in a greater degree than he had ever witnessed, or ever read of in any army, and this, without any disaster, or any unusual privation or hardship, that the officers had from the first lost all command over their men, and that the true cause of this unhappy state of affairs was to be found *in the habitual neglect of duty by the Regimental Officers*." This is the army of which the Duke said later, that "with it, he could go any where and do any thing," and, good or bad, it saved Europe—in the English sense.

One of the most cruel statements which party rancor has circulated in regard to the condition of the army is, that the rate of sickness and mortality is excessive, and that this is due to the neglect of the Government. Fortunately we have the means of showing that these statements are false. From June 1, 1861, to March 1, 1862—nine months—the annual rate of mortality for the whole army is ascertained to be 53 in a thousand, and the sickness rate 104 in a thousand. The returns for the summer campaigns are not yet printed, but it will appear from them, that in the army of the Potomac on the 10th of June, after the battle of Fair Oaks, and while the army was encamped on the Chickahominy, the whole number of sick, present and absent, compared with the whole force of that army, present and absent, was 128 in a thousand. During the stay of the army on the Peninsula it lost less than 14,000 men by death, from disease and wounds, and the annual sickness rate during the campaign was about that which has for some time prevailed in the whole army, less than ten per cent of the whole force. It appears, strange to say, that the army was more healthy when in the trenches before Yorktown, than at any other period of the campaign. Compare this with the English experience. We have already said that Wellington lost about one third of his whole army from malarious fever on his retreat from Talavera: on the 1st of October, 1811, the Anglo-Portuguese army had 56,000 men fit for duty, and 23,000 sick in hospitals; and in the Crimea, while the annual rate of mortality for the whole war was 232 in a thousand, the period of active operations, the last three months of 1854 and the first three months of 1855, shows the fearful rate of 711 deaths in every thousand men.

It can not be doubted that to many the most unfavorable symptom of our present condition is the slow progress of our arms. This slowness is more apparent than real, for the history of modern warfare scarcely shows an instance in which so great real progress has been made in the same space of time, and it is manifest that whenever our Northern soldiers have had a chance of fighting the enemy on any thing like equal terms, they have fully maintained their superiority. It is none the less true, however, that public expectation in this matter has been much disappointed, and it is curious to look at some of the explanations given for it. The Prince de Joinville, in his recent pamphlet, speaking of the battle of Fair Oaks, and of the neglect to throw bridges over the Chickahominy at the proper time, by means of which the whole rebel army might have been taken in flank, and probably destroyed, ascribes the neglect on one page to what he calls *la lenteur Américaine*, which he seems to think always leads our countrymen to let the chance slip of doing the right thing at the right time, and again on the next to "*faute d'organisation faute, de hierarchie, faute de lien, qui en resulte entre l'âme du chef et l'armée, lien puissant qui permet à un General de demander à ses soldats et d'en obtenir aveuglement ces efforts extraordinaires qui gagnent les battailles.*" In other words, General McClellan, knowing that he could gain a decisive victory by laying down half a dozen bridges, which, it is stated, were all ready for the purpose, actually refused to order his soldiers to do it, because he was afraid they would not obey his orders. And this is the Prince's judgment of an army, which, a few weeks later, according to his own account, fought five battles in as many days, all, with one excep-

tion, victories over an enemy at least double its numbers, and arrived at its new base on the James River in excellent condition, and without the slightest taint of demoralization. This illustration shows the absurdity of ascribing the want of immediate success to *la lenteur Américaine*, a quality, by the way, which we learn for the first time is one of our national characteristics.

Among the many causes which might be named, all perfectly legitimate, and presenting no obstacle which a little experience will not remove, we venture to suggest but one, and that is the character of the early military education of our higher officers. The system pursued at West Point, although admirable for qualifying officers for the scientific and staff corps of the army, seems to fail in teaching the young soldier, what is just now the most important quality he can possess for command, the character and capacity of volunteer soldiers. The system of discipline he has been taught is that which governs the regular army, a system modeled upon the English, which is, with the exception of that in use in Russia, the most brutal and demoralizing known in any army in Europe. No wonder, therefore, that when our educated soldiers are suddenly placed in high positions, and with great responsibilities, and when they discover that the sort of discipline which they have been taught is wholly out of place in securing the efficiency of a volunteer army, they are led to doubt whether it can ever be made efficient at all. These prejudices, however, are wearing away before the test of actual experience. Generals are gradually learning that they may confide in their men, even for desperate undertakings; they begin to see in their true light the many eminent qualities of the volunteer; and he, in turn, begins to understand something of that military system which seemed at first so irksome and meaningless to him; and the advance of the army in the essentials of discipline has been proportionably rapid.

There is a good deal of talk about the impossibility of conquering or subjugating the South, which is based upon very vague notions of what conquest and subjugation signify. It is surprising to find how even intelligent men have been imposed upon by this favorite boast of the rebels and their sympathizers. A pretended saying of Napoleon is quoted, that "it is impossible to prevent any people determined on achieving its independence, from accomplishing its purpose;" and it is confidently asked whether any one ever heard of the subjugation of twelve millions of people determined to be free. We reply, that history, ancient and modern, is full of instances of the only sort of conquest or subjugation which any sane man proposes shall be submitted to by the South. No one thinks it possible or necessary, for the purpose in view, to occupy the whole South with garrisons, but simply to destroy the only support upon which its arrogant pretensions are based, namely, its military power. This gone, what becomes of all the rest? and this remaining, where is there any hope of permanent peace and safety to us? For what is all war, but an appeal to force to settle questions of national interest which peaceful discussion has failed to settle; and what is an army but only another argument, the *ultima ratio*, which, if successful in decisive battles, must give the law to the conquered? To say nothing of instances in ancient history, Poland, Hungary, and Lombardy, in our day, were just as determined to be free as the South is, and quite as full of mar-

tial ardor; and certainly Prussia, Spain under the Bonaparte dynasty, and the French Empire, are all examples of nations which valued their independence, and had tenfold the resources for maintaining it which the South possesses; yet the capture of Warsaw, the surrender of Villagos, the battles of Novara, of Jena, of Salamanca, and of Waterloo, respectively, settled as definitively the fate of the inhabitants of those countries, and their future condition, as if the terms imposed by the conquering army had been freely and unanimously agreed upon by the representatives of the people in Congress assembled. And, in like manner, can any one doubt, looking at the present comparative resources of the two sections, that if we should gain two decisive battles, one in the East and the other in the West, which should result in the total disorganization of the two rebel armies, and thus enable us to interpose an impassable barrier between them, we should soon hear a voice imploring in unmistakable accents peace on our own terms? It would not be a matter of choice, but of necessity; a simple question of how far the progress of exhaustion had been carried, and that once settled, and no reasonable hope of success remaining, the war would not last a week longer. This is the experience of all nations, and our Southern rebels, notwithstanding their noisy boasting, do not differ in their capacity of resistance from the rest of mankind. "Hard pounding this, gentlemen," said the Duke of Wellington to his officers, as he threw himself within one of the unbroken squares of his heroic infantry at Waterloo, "*but we'll see who can pound the longest;*" and the ability of that infantry to "pound the longest" on that day settled the fate of Europe for generations.

Let us bend, then, our united energies to secure, as much as in us lies, success in the field, and that success gained, we may be sure that all things will follow. Let us recognize with confidence as co-workers in this great object all, never mind what opinions they may entertain about the causes of the war and the new issues which its progress has developed, who desire in all sincerity, no matter from what motive, the success of our arms. Upon such a basis, the wider and more catholic our faith becomes the better. "In essentials, Unity; in non-essentials, Liberty; in all things, Charity:" this should be our motto. The only possible hope for the South is in our own divisions. Let us remember that with success all things are possible; without it, all our hopes and theories vanish into thin air. With success in the field, we should not only disarm the rebellion, and rid ourselves forever of the pestilent tribe of domestic traitors by burying them deep in that political oblivion which covers the Tories of the Revolution, and those who sneered at the gallant exploits of our Navy in the war of 1812, but also force public opinion abroad, whose faithlessness to the great principles which underlie all modern civilization has been one of the saddest developments of this sad war, to exclaim at last, "*Invidiam gloriâ superâsti.*"

Loyal Leagues, Clubs, and Newsvenders will be furnished with any of the Society's Publications at the actual cost price.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 14.

THE PRESERVATION OF THE UNION,

A

NATIONAL ECONOMIC NECESSITY.

FROM THE GERMAN COMMERCIAL GAZETTE.

The present conflict between the North and South, having been discussed almost to exhaustion, from a political point of view, the task remained to present it from a national, economic and social point of view. This has been done in a most lucid and conclusive manner in a comprehensive circular, issued by one of the first commercial houses of New York, in which it is clearly demonsfrated that *the Preservation of the Union is an indispensable necessity for the whole civilized world.* The very complete and valuable statistical tables which have been carefully collated from the last census report, together with an extract of the essential points from the circular itself, are herewith presented to the American reader. In view of the colossal productive and commercial power of the United States, every impartial mind must approve the prospective results of the present conflict as herewith presented. Separation of the Union is so completely shown to be synonymous with retrogression of general civilization, that at this enlightened period, no one can advocate such a retrograde movement without offending against all mankind. What right-thinking man can aid with his sympathy, much less by his direct support, in the destruction of this glorious whole, which has been created by the intelligent industry of several generations? Who would willingly lend a hand in closing up the inexhaustible sources of wealth which nature with unmatched liberality has lavished upon this truly great country?

Surely no truly enlightened person in either hemisphere could be guilty of so gross an outrage against the best interests of mankind.

GROWTH OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE TEN YEARS FROM 1850 TO 1860

	Population.		Property.		Bank Capital.		Railroads.				Production, 1860	Agriculture.
	1,000 Inhabitants.		Million Dollars.		Million Dollars.		Miles.		Cost Million Dolls.		Million Dollars. Manufactures. Fisheries. Mines.	
	1850.	1860.	1850.	1860.	1850.	1860.	1850.	1860.	1850.	1860.		
New York	3,098	3,881	1,080	1,843	49	111	1,403	2,702	65	131	380	233
Pennsylvania	2,312	2,906	722	1,417	18	26	822	2,442	42	144	286	174
Ohio	1,980	2,340	505	1,194	9	7	575	2,901	11	112	125	140
Illinois	851	1,712	156	872	..	5	111	2,868	1	105	57	103
Indiana	988	1,350	203	529	2	4	228	2,126	3	70	43	81
Massachusetts	995	1,231	573	815	37	65	1,036	1,273	48	59	266	74
Kentucky	982	1,156	302	666	8	13	78	568	2	19	36	69
Missouri	682	1,182	137	501	1	9	..	817	..	42	44	71
Iowa	192	675	24	247	..	..	..	680	..	19	15	40
Maine	583	628	123	190	3	8	246	472	7	17	36	37
Maryland	583	687	219	377	8	13	253	380	12	21	43	41
Michigan	398	749	60	257	1	1	342	790	9	31	35	45
New Jersey	490	672	200	468	4	8	206	560	9	29	81	40
Connecticut	371	460	156	444	10	22	412	603	14	22	83	28
Tennessee	1,003	1,110	201	494	7	8	..	1,198	..	30	17	67
Wisconsin	305	776	42	274	..	8	20	923	1	34	29	47
Other States	7,379	9,635	2,433	5,572	70	114	2,857	9,281	73	281	324	?
Total	23,192	31,150	7,136	16,160	227	422	8,589	30,593	297	1,166	1,900	?

Value of Farms in United States,	$6,650,872,507.
" Agricultural Implements,	247,027,496.
" Horses, Cattle and Swine,	1,107,490,216.
" Animal Cut Meats,	212,871,653.
Area of the United States,	3,250,000 square miles.
" Coal Fields in United States,	200,000 "
Tonnage of Commercial Marine,	5 539,812 tons.
Value of same,	221,592,480 dollars.

DISTRIBUTION OF SOME OF THE PRINCIPAL BRANCHES OF THE ANNUAL PRODUCTION OF 1863.

AGRICULTURE.

Wheat,	bushels	171,183,387
Rye	"	20,976,286
Corn	"	830,451,707
Oats	"	172,554,688
Peas and Beans	"	15,188,013
Potatoes	"	152,181,503
Barley	"	15,635,119
Buckwheat	"	17,664,914
Hay	tons	19,129,129
Clover and Grass Seed	lbs	1,829,010
Hemp	tons	104,190
Flax	lbs	3,783,079
Flaxseed	bs	611,927
Cotton		5,198,077
Tobacco	lbs	429,390,771
Rice	"	187,130,173
Sugar Cane	hhds	302,205
Maple Sugar	lbs	38,863,884
Molasses	gals	25,000,000
Wine	"	1,860,008
Hops	lbs	11,040,012
Garden Produce		$35,300,388

MANUFACTURES.

Flour	$224,000,000
Cotton Goods	115,000,000
Timber	96,000,000
Shoes and Boots	90,000,000
Leather	72,000,000
Clothes	70,000,000
Woolen Manufs	69,000,000
Machinery	47,000,000
Prints	42,000,000
Sugar Refineries	38,500,000
Hollow Ware	28,500,000
Spirituous Liquors	25,000,000
Furniture	24,000,000
Malt, &c	18,000,000
Agricultural Implements	17,800,000
Paper	17,500,000
Soap	17,000,000
Gold and Silver Ware	19,554,580
Musical Instruments	5,791,807
Gas	11,224,380
Fisheries	12,924,092
Sewing Machines	5,605,345

MINES.

Gold		$47,744,402
Quicksilver		2,000,000
Copper	tons	14,432
Iron	"	884,474
Lead	"	9,000
Zinc Ore	"	11,800
Nickel	"	2,348
Coal	"	15,164,407
Coal Oil	barrels	1,092,450
Salt		$2,265,302

CATTLE, &C.

Horses	7,300,972
Mules	1,296,330
Sheep	24,823,566
Hogs	36,022,276

ANNUAL PRODUCTION.

Wool	lbs	60,511,343
Butter	"	460,509,854
Cheese	"	105,875,134
Honey	"	25,013,760
Wax	"	1,357,071
Silk	"	6,562

FOREIGN COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES.

	1853.	1854.	1855.	1856.	1857.	1858.	1859.	1860.	1861.	1862.
Importations—Millions Dollars	268	305	261	315	361	283	339	362	336	206
Exportations, "	230	278	275	327	363	325	357	400	249	230
Total	498	583	536	642	724	608	696	762	585	436
Of which New York City imports mills. dols.	194	181	158	214	231	153	245	238	163	175
Exports	94	101	100	121	118	86	138	146	143	217
Total	288	282	258	335	349	239	383	384	306	392

The above Tables present an interesting picture of the wealth and wonderful progress of this country. With an increase of population since 1850 of 25 per cent., or 8 millions, the value of property has increased in the same space of time 127 per cent., or 9,000 millions of dollars!—and with all this the above figures do not, by any means, give the real, entire value of the national property, for not only is the Government property and public domain not embraced therein, but the data are mainly obtained from the *Registers of direct Taxation*, in which the estimated valuations are always taken at the lowest amount of consideration for the tax-payers.

A people which, with its great extravagance in its expenditures, increases nevertheless the value of its property annually 900 millions of dollars, must not only have been prodigally endowed by nature with all the elements of wealth, but it must have developed, also, an uncommon degree of energy and intelligence in the utilization of the resources which its territory possesses.

Since 1850 the United States have increased their Banking Capital nearly 200 millions of dollars, and their Railroads 22,000 miles, at an expense of nearly 1,000 million dollars. The country has now over 32,000 miles of Railroads in active use, 30,000 miles of Water Communication, more or less artificial, and 40,000 miles of Telegraphic Lines!

The great variety in the means of support and acquisition of wealth is one of the especial advantages of this country; and the above Tables show what gigantic proportions its productive capacity has already attained in the various branches of Agriculture, Manufactures, Mining, &c., &c. Whilst the Western and Southern States show astonishing progress in Agriculture, the Northern and Eastern States have developed equally great progress in Manufactures. Foreign immigration brings to the whole country its invaluable advantages; the accumulation of capital in the Eastern States develops, in connection with the immense wealth of coal, minerals, and forests, constantly new and ever farther reaching industrial enterprises, and in these prodigious achievements the restless energy of the American brings to his aid the practical and inventive genius of the people in the shape of innumerable labor-saving machines and con-

trivances, without which, these immense triumphs over nature could never have been accomplished.

The Commercial power of the United States fully corresponds with these enormous resources. Great Britain has a more extended foreign commerce, because it imports nearly all the raw materials from foreign countries, and re-exports them as manufactured articles. Not so with the United States. This country contains *within its own territory* nearly all the raw materials in greatest abundance, and exports of these *only the surplus*, and imports only coffee, tea, sugar, and articles of luxury—and but few articles which it needs for its industry. The Commerce of United States may be seen from the above Tables, to which are added some which relate to the city of New York alone, *and which even now are on the increase.* But who can estimate with reference to the above Tables of production the magnitude of the *Internal Commerce between the several States?* Who can say *how much less this country would import, and how much more it would export*, if, in *European* fashion, the people would *economise* only a few years? Already has Europe been obliged to send here in 1861, the first year of the war, *more than* 40 *millions of dollars* to cover the balance of trade in our favor! And it may, perhaps, become as important for the great *money marts* of Europe, as for its manufacturing interests, that the Union should be restored as soon as possible to its normal condition.

The United States is truly the land—the very paradise of labor. Here is no place for idlers, be they rich or be they poor! Labor here makes all men equal; here the European noble and peasant work side by side! In no country on the face of the earth is labor more prized and honored, or better paid than here! Even *capital*, which in Europe controls labor, here becomes subordinate to and serves labor. It is the free and intelligent labor of the country that creates the Administration or the Government, that is, the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial powers of the country.

Whatever may be said against the doings and intrigues of the politicians, yet it is the highest honor of the system of government of the United States that *Free Labor*—that is to say, the equal right of all men to the pursuit of happiness—has been

recognized as the first natural and inalienable right ; and that this right has been consistently asserted in every direction ; and it is *the Union alone and above all* which protects this fundamental right against all possible assumption of power by single states, and which gives it *permanent and national guarantees.* The Union, therefore, represents the principles of *free Labor, free Intercourse, free River and Lake Navigation, free Schools, free Press, and free Religion.* The Union guarantees in its entire immense extent of 3,250,000 square miles (almost as large as all Europe), to all its present and future inhabitants *the most unlimited liberty of thought, commerce, and industry.*

Unquestionably it is mainly this great principle which has given to the Union its vast power and prosperity, and which cannot fail to secure to it a still more glorious future. Of what use would be to this country its rich and fertile lands, if the West were separated from the East, and the North from the South, by all sorts of inter-state restrictions and jealousies; if the people were compelled to surrender regularly a large portion of its working population to standing armies ; or if it were restrained in the free exercise of its labor and industry by inter-state tariffs, or by a system of guilds, like that remnant of the middle ages in Europe?

In the Old Country, where a different condition of things requires a different system of government, the people are proud, and very properly so, of the great progress which has been made there, in facilitating intercourse amongst the different peoples, in the abolition of river dues, guilds, the progress of free trade, and the emancipation of the serfs; and yet all these achievements of modern times are but fragments of the great and general freedom of labor, which the Union guarantees for all time to come, to every citizen, native and adopted, as well as to the future immigrant.

Viewed from this stand-point, the attempt of the Rebels to destroy the Union, and to establish in its stead a Confederacy based upon Human Slavery as its corner stone, cannot be regarded as other than a crime against this Nineteenth Century, and as an attempt against all recognized human rights.

Can any one doubt as to the result of this conflict? As well might we assume that England would re-enact its former system

of protective duties, its corn laws, and navigation act; that Germany would revive the old guilds, soccage service, and religious persecutions; that Russia would restore the just abolished serfdom. In fact, we might as well assume that civilization would retrograde, and that the great civilized nations of Europe would go back to the feudal system of the middle ages!

The great natural rights of man, that have their being in the Union, are more powerful by far than all the armies or intrigues of the enemies of the Union. The fortune of war has not much favored the North during the past year, and yet do we see that the idea of the Union has resumed entire sway again in the Slave Border States of Delaware, Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri, and a large portion of Virginia, and that even the question of the total abolition of slavery is assuming in those States the most forcible prominence.

Our country has always developed most actively after every commercial crisis, and it will surely emerge from the present political crisis with regenerated and greater power.

☞ *Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No. 863 Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.*

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 15.

ELEMENTS OF DISCORD IN SECESSIA.

That the elements of discord and dissolution have been and are at work in the region of rebeldom is clearly manifest from an inspection of such of the Southern newspapers as have passed through our lines, or have come to us from abroad. In various ways, and by means of divers involuntary complaints, they in effect admit that the rebellion has thus far proved a failure. Besides, they show that they have dark forebodings as to the future. Some of the public men of the South, as we learn from private sources, chafe under the prominence of so many "Northern men with Southern principles" among them, and openly express doubts as to their reliability. They take pains continually to point out how many Yankees by birth are leading editors, or are filling high official positions among them. Their objections to these people, which appear to us to be prompted by jealousy, are of a sort suitable to and characteristic of the region in which they are made, and are not at all adapted to the United States or any foreign market. When, for example, they object to these renegades on the ground that they are not of the Norman race, (just as though they were not as much so as Pickens, Keitt, Wise, Cobb, Bragg, or Magruder,) they make a point that may tell in South Carolina, but which will only cause merriment elsewhere. When they urge against Yancey and Slidell the additional grounds that the former did not kill his uncle in a regular duel, and that the latter is the son of a New York tallow-chandler, we do not recognize the force of their position.

The fact that Yancey killed his kinsman, for which, even under the lax administration of the criminal law in Alabama, he was convicted, though he subsequently managed to procure a pardon, is enough, regardless of the mode in which he did the deed. He stands before the world as a convicted felon, who is at large through the exercise of Executive clemency. As to Slidell's origin we care nothing. We know that he sets up for an aristocrat and a leader of fashion in Paris, and to that extent exhibits a pretension that may appear ridiculous to those acquainted with his history; but, for our part, we would think better of him if he had exercised his father's vocation in an honest way in this his native city, than we do when we call to mind his disreputable financial schemes in the South, and his renegadism, treason, and his subsequent prudent transfer of his questionably gotten means beyond the jurisdiction of the region to the ruin of which he has so largely contributed.

This jealousy and distrust on the part of the native born chivalry towards the Northern born chivalry who have got ahead of them in political and financial position, is one of the most significant signs of the times.

Another fertile source of discontent in the South is the circumstance which has leaked out, in spite of every effort to conceal it, that many wealthy secessionists, especially of the politician class, have put their money abroad. Though specious pretexts have been given out to excuse this, they do not satisfy the people. Those who have not had the foresight to take this precaution are vexed with those who have. People of limited means are beginning to make inquiry on the subject, and to demand why their political leaders have placed their funds beyond seas, and to insinuate doubts as to whether those who have done so are worthy of confidence. No more powerful argument against the prospects of the so-called Confederate States could be adduced than the production of the accounts of the bankers of London and Paris with the leaders of the rebellion.

This growing suspicion on the part of the people of the South of their leaders, arising from the fact that so many of them have sent their available means to foreign parts, is another very significant sign of the times. Still, much money continues to go out by way of Matamoros.

There is yet another potent cause of discontent which is making itself apparent. Every promise held out by the rebel leaders has been met by a stubborn fact to the contrary. Those who were lured into treason by the flattering hope of "peaceable secession," have encountered war, and have been forced to submit to a relentless (unless they owned twenty negroes) conscription. Those who were enticed by promises of free trade, have had to submit to a tariff, a most exorbitant direct taxation, and an export duty on cotton. Those who were persuaded that cotton is king, have been compelled to burn it (when exposed to capture), or, as is the practice more recently, to sell it to De Bow and to the cotton agents of the Confederates at a low figure in paper, and are made to raise corn for the supply of the army in its stead. Those who were taught that coercion on the part of the United States Government was a horrible—indeed an insupportable enormity,—have been coerced into all these measures, and those to whom submission to the constitution and laws of the United States was a bugbear, have been forced to submit to oppressions which nothing but a military despotism set on foot to establish some stronger form of government than a republic would dare to inaugurate. It is true that the office-holders of the South are satisfied. They have the spoils. The rare opportunities for speculation afforded by troublous times, are not unimproved by them. They have a government strong enough to repress the unarmed and unorganized masses, so long as they have the control of a large army, and a monopoly of all the appliances of war, and they will continue to make hay while the sun shines. Still, even among them, an element of dissolution is silently at work. To borrow the language of a distinguished prelate of Ireland, "combinations for iniquitous purposes are frequently dissolved, from a bare contemplation on the part of each of the individuals composing them of the utter worthlessness of all the rest."

After all, the most powerful of the causes at work to break down the rebellion, is the condition of mind that has been brought about by the facts transpiring around them among the masses in the South. Men will think. All believers in a democratic government, in the enlarged sense of the phrase, are fully persuaded that though a portion of the people may be led

astray for a time, in the end they will not continue to act against their own interest. Suffering and hardships make the minds of men wonderfully acute to avert them. Not one white man in ten in the South owns a slave. Those who are not slave-owners, must see that slave labor operates in competition against their labor, and that large slave-holders hire their negroes out at a cheaper rate than those negroes would hire themselves for were they free. Questions come up before their minds, even when, as conscripts, they are gathered around their camp-fires, which are fraught with danger to the politicians that have ensnared them. They ask themselves what they are called upon to fight for, and what interest they have in the issues that have been made for them. They inquire whether they want a stronger form of government than that adopted by their forefathers, who thought a republic preferable to a monarchy. Suggestions will arise like the following: Have we not a military despotism upon us? Who have been, and are, save the politicians, and perhaps, some of the slave-holders, benefitted by it? Are we in favor of perilling our lives, after leaving our families unprovided for, to maintain slave labor in the hands of capitalists (to many of whom it operates as an exemption), to be used in competition with our own? Would we not get higher wages, even if the negroes were made free and hired in the country? Are we in favor of an export duty on cotton in addition to a tariff, and a direct taxation more burdensome than ever known on this continent before? How much greater is our funded debt than that of the United States? Will not our leaders in any event *repudiate* it, and even the paper with which we are paid, before long? Is cotton king? Has it opened so much as one of our ports? Does burning it damage us or the people of the North the most? Has the attempt at a government made by Jeff. Davis & Co. accomplished anything thus far that can be regarded as really advantageous either to it or to us, the people? Has it got possession of either the states or the territories it covets? Is it not a decided failure, and is it not rapidly tending from bad to worse? If this is not so, why are the old rats, like Slidell, deserting the sinking ship, and why have he and so many of our contractors and leading politicians put their money on the

other side of the Atlantic? In short, are we willing to suffer and perhaps to die fighting against people with whose views we fully agree, and with whom we have a common interest, in order to continue and aggravate the evils that have been brought upon us, and for no other purpose than to sustain a set of political harpies, who are fattening upon our misfortunes, and who look down upon us with a lordly contempt?

Unless the self-styled chivalry, (or, as Prentice calls them, the "Chivalryites,") who rule the South can keep the rank and file from thinking, trouble will arise in their midst before they anticipate it. When the outraged masses, goaded at last beyond endurance, rise up against them, such as may not have taken time by the forelock, and followed their money abroad, may meet with a swift and terrible retribution, instead of surviving to experience in exile the weary pangs of remorse.

THE VULGARITY OF TREASON.

(*See the Appendix to this Article.*)

This article, from *Wilkes' Spirit of the Times*, has been revised and materially altered and enlarged by one of the contributors to the Loyal Publication Society. Mr. Wilkes is not responsible for the changes made.

The secession leaders in the South divide mankind into two classes—Secessionists and Abolitionists. The letter from Beauregard to Bragg that was intercepted in Kentucky, urged that this classification be adopted, and the suggestion has been acted upon. Already, they had declared Secessionists and Unionists were of different races: that the former were Normans, and the latter Saxons. The new classification is not regarded as destructive, but rather as cumulative of the old; and now, among the *elite* of the rebellion, the white human family are in general held to consist of Norman Secessionists and Saxon Abolitionists.

That the leaders of the secession movement intended, from the outset, to give up republicanism as being incompatible with slavery, and to adopt a stronger and more aristocratic form of

government, has long been apparent.* That such was their design, was well known before divers of them admitted it in print. Hence their assumption of feudal descent, and the desire to ape the aristocracy of the dark ages which has cropped out on divers occasions in a most ludicrous manner. Their efforts in this direction are truly ridiculous. Men bearing such vulgar Saxon names as Cobb, Wise, Spratt, Keitt, Toombs, Bragg, Johns(t)on, (with or without the "t,") and Yancey, presume strongly on the ignorance of mankind when they pretend that they are of the Norman race. Only imagine a Norman bearing such a name as Magruder! It would be easier for Smith, Brown, Jones, and Robinson to prove by their names, undisguised by a surplus letter, a mediæval lineage. Such, however, are the boasted and boastful Normans of secessia. Among them are to be found names which are not merely commonplace, as are the foregoing, or, as is the name Mason, but which, so far from being Norman or aristocratic, are intensely vulgar, and possess a signification indicative of the most humble and degraded Saxon origin. A friend suggests that it is easier to believe that the ancestors of such men as Wigfall, Pickens and Letcher, were among the barbers, petty thieves, and pimps, who in part constituted the camp-followers of the knights of old than that those now known by such appellations are of feudal descent. Such names have no place in the heraldic records of any race. All of the names cited, when we consider the arrogance of their owners, are bad enough, but the two last are really very impressive as to what must have been the moral *status* of the first of the ancestors of Governors Pickens and Letcher who were dubbed with them. Truly when we bear in mind that South Carolina took the initiative in robbing the United States government, and her citizens lead off in confiscating northern debts, and that Virginia was the only one of the colonies that was for a time the Botany Bay of England, it does seem most remarkable that their secession chief magistrates should be the possessors of such appropriate names.

---

* "Democracy, in its original philosophical sense, is, indeed, incompatible with slavery, and the whole system of Southern society."—*Mr. Garnett of Virginia, in his letter to Mr. Trescott of South Carolina.*

Shakspeare tells us that a rose by any other name would smell as sweet, but divers of the self-styled aristocracy of Secessia appear to have differed from him in opinion, and to have been in many instances ashamed of the patronymics which they inherited. Like Mr. Thackeray's footman, James Plush, who after he had made a fortune by a gambling speculation in railway shares, assumed the Norman style of James de la Pluche, with a suitable coat of arms, they have sought a finer nomenclature. Peter Gustav Toutant (he is registered as Peter Gustav Toutant Beauregard in the General Catalogue of West Point) assumed the "Beauregard" (good countenance), which has the merit of being a fancy if not an aristocratic name, and subsequently dropped the "Peter," probably because he thought it plebian, while all the other male members of his immediate family are yet known as the Messrs. Toutant. What explanation can he give of the changes made that will relieve him from the imputation of snobbishness? Why one bearing the name of R. Barnwell Smith should wish to substitute for his surname the unchivalric name of Rhett we are at a loss to discover, although we can easily imagine that he might desire to get rid of his middle name—the felonious name of Barnwell, made notorious by George Barnwell as the paramour of Sarah Milwood, and as a murderer duly convicted and executed. Bow and Morse are unmistakable and common Saxon names, and as such are clearly incompatible with the Norman prefix of "De." Still the cotton agent of Mr. Jeff. Davis' government, by what authority we know not, sports the name of De Bow, without so much as making it plausible by spelling it De B-e-a-u; and we have heard of a secession editor in Texas (originally from Maine), who got a statute passed, changing his name from Morse to De Morse, which was vetoed by Gen. Houston, the then President of the republic of Texas, on the ground that he was opposed to such statutes on principle and for various reasons—among the rest, because they might operate so as to defeat the collection of foreign debts. Still the Act was passed over the veto by a constitutional majority.

Why Levy, of Florida, got the Legislature of that State to change his name to Yulee, we do not know. He is certainly of an ancient lineage, and may have merely effected a restora-

tion of his ancestral surname. We have not been able to ascertain what was the family name of the Impenitent Thief, though a distant relative of Mr. Levy, Mr. Judah P. [Query—was it not originally Judas I.?] Benjamin, might, if inquired of, furnish reliable information on the subject, such as is known among lawyers as "reputation in the family."*

Now, the foregoing are but instances of individual pretension and personal snobbishness on the part of the beautiful set of Normans—the overseers or their descendants turned planters, who have proclaimed themselves to be the "master race" on this continent—who have rebelled against a Republic, coerced the laboring classes among them, and have attempted to set up a strong government of their own. As a matter of course, their government has shown itself to be as vulgarly pretentious and as snobbish as themselves. Ignorant of those principles of good taste which suggest that the nomenclature which may not be improper when applied to blooded stock, is most unsuitable to the war vessels of a nation, the officials of Secessia christened its first little war steamers the "Lady Polk" and the "Lady Davis." As "lord" is the correlative of "lady," such appellations can only be permissible in case Bishop Polk were my Lord Bishop General Leonidas Polk, and the GREAT REPUDIATOR my Lord Jeff. Davis. It is said that straws show how the wind blows: hence, such a nomenclature may be held significant—or, indeed, ominous.

The vulgar pretentiousness and pretentious vulgarity of the traitors who are ruling the masses of the South, has long made them the laughing-stock of all really well-bred people both here and abroad. It must occasionally flash across the minds of the secession leaders themselves that they have been and are making a most absurd and diverting *exposé* of their arrogance and weakness. Cicero said that he wondered whether a soothsayer could look a southsayer in the face without smiling. We should like to witness a *rencontre* between two of these men of

---

* The writer seems to have acted upon a suggestion of Daniel O'Connell, and to have *inferred* the descent of Messrs. Levy-Yulee and Benjamin from their principles—concluding from *them* that those individuals must be descendants of the Impenitent Thief.

the "master race," for example, between Barnwell-Smith-Rhett and Levy-Yulee. Only fancy how they would look?

Still there are persons at the North, who are. of course, ignorant, underbred, and, to say the least, of questionable social position, who actually believe in the pretentions of the Southern leaders, and who think that it indicates gentility on their part to express a sympathy with traitors and to play the sycophant to treason. They feel so flattered by some social recognition they may have secured in former times from those who now contemn them as Saxons and abolitionists, that they cringe before their assumptions, and requite their scorn by fawning even at this time. This is both natural and right. If Northern parvenus and traitors at heart, look up to Southern parvenus, who are in armed treason, as their superiors, it is but proper that they should do so; for the latter occupy the more manly and respectable position when compared with their own.

Real gentlemen and ladies are not only too well informed, but have too much spirit to commit such a blunder. They possess a more thorough knowledge of the social world, a greater elevation of character and better principles, not to speak of better taste.

In the mean time, we should not be surprised if the GREAT REPUDIATOR were to be so encouraged at the success of the experiments made by himself and friends in the way of preparing for a stronger form of government, as on some fine day to make a *coup d'etat* and declare himself Emperor, and assume the style of JEFFERSON I.

Although this being ashamed of their ancestral names, hum ble though they be; this arrogant though groundess assumption of a noble origin, and this pretentious nomenclature of their little war-steamers, indicates (apart from their printed avowals), that the LEADER of the rebellion and his friends aim at the establishment of an Empire, with a peerage to sustain it; still, the incongruity of their names with feudal titles reminds us of a similar attempt made by Soulouque, the negro Emperor of San Domingo, who, in carrying out his programme, both amused and astonished the world by investing his sable courtiers with such titles as Prince of Marmalade, Duke of Lemonade, and Baron of Peas. Without waiting for the rebellion to succeed, for that can never happen until the Confederate Treasury Notes

are paid—i. e., "six months after the day of judgment"*—we may expect the Emperor JEFFERSON I. to take the Emperor Soulouque as his model, and surround his throne by a court of nobles, all like himself and his Empress Varina, of the Norman race, and invested with titles, not borrowed from the old world, but still, not the less appropriate. He can make Floyd (for obvious reasons), Prince of Spoliation; Benjamin (on account of his brilliant effort at the Houmas land swindle), Duke of Houmas; Slidell, his Minister to France (who, from his proficiency at cards, is known at New Orleans as "*Sly-deal;*" and who, as "the Thurlow Weed of the South,"† arranged the Plaquemine election frauds), *le Marquis de Faro et le Comte de Plaquemine;* Meminger (from the direction his financial schemes have taken) Earl of Salt River and Viscount of Papier Maché; and Yancey, (who was convicted for killing his uncle, but subsequently pardoned), Baron of Homicide. The self-created "Knights of the Golden Circle" (whose very style is a standing satire upon a government which has no gold, though it owes, and will soon repudiate an immense funded debt, and has out a great deal of paper), can be invested with a *bona fide* order of knighthood by the appropriate name of "*Knights of the Paper Circle.*" And finally, he can do further all that may be in his power to make the rebellion reputable by organizing a "Legion of Secession," having two grand divisions: one for military merit, with a jet cross relieved by a gilt chain and hand-cuffs, emblematic of the divine right of negro slavery, for the maintenance and extension of which this war is waged, suspended by a black ribbon, as its badge; and the other for civil merit—(for example, as a reward for those who, by exhibiting mulattoes and quadroons among their stock of slaves, show that they have taken an interest in improving the condition of the degraded African race,)—with a yellow bronze medal bearing a motto and an appropriate number suspended by a *mauve* ribbon as its distinction. Such an exhibition of "high life below stairs" is all that is wanted to make what is now called "The Southern Confederacy" complete.

---

* Rebel Treasury Notes payable "six months after the independence of the Confederate States shall have been recognized by the United States," are spoken of privately in the South as notes payable "six months after the day of judgment."

† This phrase comes from "Russell's Diary."

APPENDIX TO THE FOREGOING ARTICLE— "THE VULGARITY OF TREASON."

Extracts from Rebel Organs.

(*From the "Charleston Mercury."*)

Our women are all conservative, moral, religious, and sensitively modest, and abhor the North for its infidelity, gross immorality, licentiousness, anarchy, and agrarianism. 'Tis they and the clergy who lead and direct the disunion movement. It is a gross mistake to suppose that Abolition alone is the cause of dissension between the North and the South. The Cavaliers, Jacobites, and Huguenots, who settled the South, naturally hate, contemn, and despise the Puritans who settled the North. The former are master races—the latter a slave race, and de-descendants of the Saxon serfs!

We are the most aristocratic people in the world. Pride of caste, and color, and privilege, makes every white man an aristocrat in feeling. Aristocracy is the only safeguard of liberty, the only power watchful and strong enough to exclude monarchial despotism. At the North, the progress and tendency of opinion is to pure democracy, less government, anarchy, and agrarianism. Military despotism is far preferable to Northern democracy, agrarianism, infidelity, and free love.

Our enemies, the stupid, sensual, ignorant masses of the North, who are as foolish as they are depraved, could not read the signs of the times, did not dream of disunion, but rushed on as heedlessly as a greedy drove of hungry hogs, at the call of their owners. They were promised plunder, and find a famine; promised bread, and were given a stone. Our enemies were starving and disorganized. The cold, naked, hungry masses are at war with their leaders. They are mute, paralyzed, panic-stricken, and have no plan of action for the future.

Better, a thousand times better, to come under the dominion of free negroes, or of Gypsies, than of Yankees, or low Germans, or Canadians. Gypsies and free negroes have many amiable, noble, and generous traits; the Yankees, sour-crout Germans, filthy, whiskey-drinking Irish, and Canadians, have none. Senator Wade says, and Seward too, that the North will absorb Canada. They are half true; the vile, sensual, animal, brutal,

superstitious Democracy of Canada and the Yankee States will coalesce; and Senator Johnson of Tennessee will join them. But when Canada and Western New York, and New England, and the whole beastly, puritanic, "sour-crout," free-negro, filthy, whiskey-drinking Irish, infidel, superstitious, licentious, Democratic population of the North become masters of New York—what then? Out of the city, the State of New York is Yankee and puritanical, composed of as base, unprincipled, superstitious, licentious, and agrarian and anarchical population as any on earth. Nay, we do not hesitate to say, it is the vilest population on earth.

(*From the Louisville, Ky., Courier.**)

We are not brothers of the Yankees, and the "Slavery Question" is merely the *pretext*, not the cause, of the war. The true "irrepressible conflict" lies fundamentally in the hereditary hostility, the sacred animosity, the eternal antagonism, between the two races engaged.

The Norman cavalier cannot brook the vulgar familiarity of the Saxon Yankee, while the latter is continually devising some plan to bring down his aristocratic neighbor to his own detested level. Thus was the contest waged in the old United States.

As our Norman kinsmen in England, always a minority, have ruled their Saxon countrymen in political vassalage up to the present day—so have we, the "Slave Oligarchs," governed the Yankees till within a twelvemonth. We framed the Constitution, for seventy years moulded the policy of the government, and placed our own men, or "Northern men with Southern principles," in power.

On the 6th November, 1860, the Puritans emancipated themselves, and are now in violent insurrection against their former owners. This insane holiday freak wil not last long, however, for, dastards in fight, and incapable of self-government, they will inevitably again fall under the control of the superior race. A few more "Bull Run" thrashings will bring them once more under the yoke, as docile as the most loyal of our Ethiopian "chattels."

---

* This paper was driven out of Louisville, and was printed for a time under the protection of the rebel army at Bowling Green. It has since died.

DIALOGUE

Between an Old-fashioned Jackson Democrat and a Copperhead.

Copperhead.—Good morning, neighbor. I have called to have a little chat with you on the condition of our country. Some of us think that the time has arrived for the people to do something.

Democrat.—I am glad to see you, and the more so as you seem to think that the time for action has arrived. I have been all along and am still in favor of the vigorous prosecution of the war, and I hope, from the remark you have just made, that you have at last come around to my opinion.

Cop.—Not exactly. If the war were conducted on such principles as I approve, I might go in heartily for it, but as it is, I am not inclined to support Mr. Lincoln's policy.

Dem.—What objections have you to it?

Cop.—I did not vote for Lincoln, as you know, and I am opposed to coercion, and to making the war a war against slavery. I don't like the employment of negroes as soldiers, and last of all I am determined not to support any unconstitutional measures.

Dem.—I did not vote for President Lincoln either, as you well know, but as he has been elected fairly under the Constitution he is my President now, and I am ready to spend my money and my blood to sustain him against Jefferson Davis, who commenced his political career as a repudiator, and ended it as a traitor. As to making the war a war against slavery, that is all right. When some 200,000 slave owners allowed their leaders to drag them into a war against a republican form of government, which they denounced as a failure, and to establish a military despotism, with a view to make it the

foundation of a stronger form of civil government, it looked to me as though slavery was making war against civil liberty. Those who begun the war by firing on our flag at Sumter have made it what it is. They alone are responsible for the issues which they have tendered, and we, the American people, have accepted. By an Act of our Congress their property is forfeited, and their slaves are declared free. Would you have them made slaves again? Is there any power granted by our Constitution to Congress to make slaves of them again? I recognize and respect that Act as an accomplished fact, and will do all in my power to enforce it as well as every other law of the land. So far as making soldiers of the negroes, if they choose to volunteer, I see no objection to it. General Washington employed negroes as soldiers. So did General Jackson (who, when living, was my political chief), at the battle of New Orleans. Even the rebel Governor Moore, of Louisiana, set us a recent precedent for doing so by raising what he called his native guards, who were nothing but negroes and mulattoes.* You say you will support no unconstitutional measures. In this I fully agree with you, though I probably differ from you as to what those measures may be.

Cop.—That, I think, is hardly possible. You don't mean to say that you intend to support all the measures of Lincoln's administration?

Dem.—I do. The United States Government, no matter who for the time being is elected to administer it, is my government. Mr. Jefferson Davis, and his fellow rebels, and their dupes, are in arms against the Constitution, and have no right to claim that any measures resorted to to maintain that Constitution are unconstitutional. They have voluntarily declared themselves not under the protection of the Constitution. Their friends, if any they have in this country, even though they have not openly avowed themselves such, have no right to do for them what they will not do for themselves. Traitors in

---

* How could the rebels exhibit greater effrontery than by crying out against our employing negroes as volunteers after Gov. Moore had set us the example *and after Albert Pike had recruited Indians?*

arms have no rights under our Constitution and laws. By their treason they have forfeited all their previously recognized rights, and their lives into the bargain.

Cop.—I thought you were a Democrat! Is it possible that you have changed, and are now an unconditional supporter of Lincoln?

Dem.—I am a Democrat—a Jackson Democrat—as I have ever been, and expect to continue to be; and I am an unconditional supporter of President Lincoln's, and of anybody else's administration that may come into power under the Constitution, as against the so-called Government of Jefferson Davis. It is because I am a Democrat that I oppose a military despotism, set up to subvert democracy, and to establish an oligarchy monarchy, or some stronger form of government. I will tell you what is more. I have served my term of nine months in the army, and have been honorably discharged, but I am still a war Democrat, and am ready to re-enlist whenever I deem it necessary. My comrades and myself are determined that this rebellion shall be put down, not by a shuffling compromise, but by force of arms. The people are with us, and we intend to succeed. Whenever Hooker or Rosecrans wants more men, they will be forthcoming. We know that the non-slaveowners of the South are with us in interest, and men are not blind to their true interests long. As to Jefferson Davis, what claim has he upon any true Democrat? A traitor to our Constitution, he don't even show a decent outward respect to his own. Did he not issue a proclamation for privateers, when his own Constitution provided that only Congress could authorize privateering? Under his own Constitution, how can he claim to be eligible to the Presidency?—for was he not born in Kentucky, which never was, is not now, and never will be a part of the so-called Confederate States?

Cop.—You misunderstand me. I am not advocating the cause of the Confederate States.

Dem.—Not openly; but what you are doing seems to me to amount to much the same thing.

Cop.—By no means. My special object in calling is to see

if you won't contribute something to aid the "Society for the diffusion of useful Political Knowledge."

Dem.—You are a little too late. We old-fashioned War Democrats of the Jackson school have our opinion of that society, and it is formed in part from a knowledge of the character of the men who compose it. Thus far, none of them seem to have fought for their country. It may be that they have constitutional scruples against doing so. We think that some people in this country sympathize so strongly, not with the South, but with the despots that are ruling the South, that, before long, it may be necessary to do what Gen. Washington recommended in a similar case—to send them where they properly belong. Your Society for the diffusion of useful political knowledge don't suit me. I and my sort in this neighborhood are for the war, and have subscribed to the fund of the Loyal Publication Society.

Cop.—Indeed! Then I am too late. Good day. [*Aside.*] This is really too bad! Since we failed in our secret negotiations with Richmond, and it got out, these old Democrats appear to have turned against us. We must try some other dodge. If we can do no better, we must at least make the best use we can of the word "constitutional." I must consult with our old office-holders, now sorely against their will out of place, and see if they can't get up some new organization that may break down this Loyal Publication Society and save us. It will never do to let this war be ended by plain fighting—for, if that were the case, where would we be?

☞ *Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No.* 863 *Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.*

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
863 BROADWAY.
No. 16.

ADDRESS

READ AT THE INAUGURAL MEETING OF THE LOYAL NATIONAL LEAGUE, BY THE REQUEST OF THE LEAGUE, IN UNION SQUARE, NEW YORK, ON THE 11TH OF APRIL, 1863.

It is just and wise that men engaged in a great and arduous cause should profess anew, from time to time, their faith, and pledge themselves to one another, to stand by their cause to the last extremity, even at the sacrifice of all they have and all that God has given them—their wealth, their blood, and their children's blood. We solemnly pledge all this to our cause, for it is the cause of our Country and her noble history, of freedom, and justice, and truth—it is the cause of all we hold dearest on this earth: we profess and pledge this—plainly, broadly, openly in the cheering time of success, and most fervently in the day of trial and reverses.

We recollect how, two years ago, when reckless arrogance attacked Fort Sumter, the response to that boom of treasonable cannon was read, in our city, in the flag of our country—waving from every steeple and school-house, from City Hall and Court House, from every shop window and market stall, and fluttering in the hand of every child, and on the head-gear of every horse in the busy street. Two years have passed; uncounted sacrifices have been made—sacrifices of wealth, of blood, and limb, and life—of friendship and brotherhood, of endeared and hallowed pursuits and sacred ties—and still the civil war is raging in bitterness and heart-burning—still we make the same profession, and still we pledge ourselves firmly to hold on to our cause, and persevere in the struggle into which unrighteous men, bewildered by pride, and stimulated by bitter hatred, have plunged us.

We profess ourselves to be loyal citizens of these United States; and by loyalty we mean a candid and loving devotion to the object to which a loyal man—a loyal husband, a loyal friend, a loyal citizen—devotes himself. We eschew the attenuated arguments derived by trifling scholars from meagre etymology. We take the core and substance of this weighty word, and pledge ourselves that we will loyally—not merely outwardly and formally, according to the letter, but frankly, fervently and according to the spirit—adhere to our country, to her institutions, to freedom, and her power, and to that great institution called the government of our country, founded by our fathers, and loved by their sons, and by all right-minded men who have become citizens of this land by choice and not by birth—who have wedded this country in the maturity of their age as verily their own. We pledge ourselves as National men devoted to the Nationality of this great people. No government can wholly dispense with loyalty, except the

fiercest despotism ruling by naked intimidation; but a republic stands in greater need of it than any other government, and most of all a republic beset by open rebellion and insidious treason. Loyalty is pre-eminently a civic virtue in a free country. It is patriotism cast in the graceful mould of candid devotion to the harmless government of an unshackled nation.

In pledging ourselves thus, we know of no party. Parties are unavoidable in free countries, and may be useful if they acknowledge the country far above themselves, and remain within the sanctity of the fundamental law which protects the enjoyment of liberty prepared for all within its sacred domain. But Party has no meaning in far the greater number of the highest and the common relations of human life. When we are ailing, we do not take medicine by party prescription. We do not build ships by party measurement; we do not pray for our daily bread by party distinctions; we do not take our chosen ones to our bosoms by party demarcations, nor do we eat or drink, sleep or wake, as partisans. We do not enjoy the flowers of spring, nor do we harvest the grain, by party lines. We do not incur punishments for infractions of the commandments according to party creeds. We do no pursue truth, or cultivate science, by party dogmas; and we do not, we must not, love and defend our country and our liberty, dear to us as part and portion of our very selves, according to party rules. Woe to him who does. When a house is on fire, and a mother with her child cries for help at the window above, shall the firemen at the engine be allowed to trifle away the precious time in party bickerings, or is then the only word—"Water! pump away; up with the ladder!"

Let us not be like the Byzantines, those wretches who quarrelled about contemptible party refinements, theological though they were, while the truculent Mussulman was steadily drawing nearer—nay, some of whom would even go to the lord of the crescent, and with a craven heart would beg for a pittance of the spoil, so that they would be spared, and could vent their party spleen against their kin in blood, and fellows in religion.

We know of no party in our present troubles; the word is here an empty word. The only line which divides the people of the North, runs between the mass of loyal men who stand by their country, no matter to what place of political meeting they were used to resort, or with what accent they utter the language of the land, or what religion they profess, or what sentiments they may have uttered in the excitement of former discussions, on the one hand, and those on the other hand, who keep outside of that line—traitors to their country in the hour of need—or those who allow themselves to be misled by shallow names, and by reminiscences which cling around those names from by-gone days, finding no application in a time which asks for things more sterling than names, theories, or platforms.

If an alien enemy were to land his hosts on your shores, would you fly to your arms and ring the tocsin because your country is in danger, or would you meditatively look at your sword and gun, and spend your time in pondering whether the administration in power, which must and can alone direct the defence of your hearths, has a right to be styled by this or that party name, or whether it came into power with your assistance, and will appoint some of your party to posts of honor or comfortable emolu-

ments? And will any one now lose his time and fair name as an honest and brave citizen, when no foreigner, indeed, threatens your country, at least not directly, but far more, when a reckless host of law-defying men, heaping upon you the vilest vituperation that men who do not leave behind them the ingenuity of civilization when they relapse into barbarism, can invent—when this host threatens to sunder your country and cleave your very history in twain, to deprive you of your rivers which God has given you, to extinguish your nationality, to break down your liberty and to make that land, which the Distributor of our sphere's geography has placed between the old and older world as the greatest link of that civilization which is destined to encircle the globe—to make that land the hot-bed of angry petty powers, sinking deeper and deeper as they quarrel and fight, and quarrelling and fighting more angrily as they sink deeper? It is the very thing your foreign enemies desire, and have long desired. When nullification threatened to bring about secession—and the term secession was used at that early period—foreign journals stated in distinct words that England was deeply interested in the contest; for nullification might bring on secession, and secession would cause a general disruption—an occurrence which would redound to the essential benefit of Great Britain.

But the traitors of the North, who have been so aptly called adders or copperheads—striking, as these reptiles do, more secretly and deadly even than the rattlesnake, which has some chivalry, at least in its tail—believe, or pretend to believe, that no fragmentary disruption would follow a division of our country into North and South, and advocate a compromise, by which they affect to believe that the two portions may possibly be reunited after a provisional division, as our pedlers putty a broken china cup.

As to the first, that we might pleasantly divide into two comfortable portions, we prefer being guided by the experience of all history, to following the traitors in their teachings. We will not hear of it. We live in an age when the word is Nationalization, not De-nationalization; when fair Italy has risen, like a new-born goddess, out of the foaming waves of the Mediterranean. All destruction is quick and easy; all growth and formation is slow and toilsome. Nations break up, like splendid mirrors dashed to the ground. They do not break into a number of well-shaped, neatly framed little looking-glasses. But a far more solemn truth even than this comes here into play. It is with nations as with families and with individuals. Those destined by nature to live in the bonds of friendship and mutual kindliness, become the bitterest and most irreconcilable enemies, when once fairly separated in angry enmity; in precisely the same degree in which affection and good-will were intended to subsist between them. We must have back the South, or else those who will not reunite with us must leave the country; we must have the country at any price. If, however, a plain division between the North and the South could take place, who will deny that those very traitors would instantly begin to manœuvre for a gradual annexation of the North to the South? It is known to be so. Some of them, void of all shame, have avowed it. They are ready to petition on their knees for annexation to the South, and to let the condescending grantor, "holding the while his nose," introduce slavery, that blessed "corner-stone of" the newest "civilization," into the

North, which has been happily purged from this evil. Let us put the heel on this adder, and bruise all treason out of its head.

As to the compromise which they propose, we know of no compromise with crime that is not criminal itself, and senseless in addition to its being wicked. New guarantees, indeed, may be asked for at the proper time, but it is now our turn to ask for them. They will be guarantees of peace, of the undisturbed integrity of our country, of law, and liberty, and security, asked for and insisted upon by the Union men, who now pledge themselves not to listen to the words, compromise, new guarantees for the South, armistice, or convention of delegates from the South and North—as long as this war shall last, until the North is victorious, and shall have established again the national authority over the length and breadth of the country as it was; over the United States dominion as it was before the breaking out of the crime, which is now ruining our fair land—ruining it in point of wealth, but, with God's help, elevating it in character, strength, and dignity.

We believe that the question of the issue, which must attend the present contest, according to the character it has now acquired, is reduced to these simple words—Either the North conquers the South, or the South conquers the North. Make up your minds for this alternative. Either the North conquers the South and re-establishes law, freedom, and the integrity of our country, or the South conquers the North by arms, or by treason at home, and covers our portion of the country with disgrace and slavery.

Let us not shrink from facts or mince the truth, but rather plainly present to our minds the essential character of the struggle in which hundreds of thousands, that ought to be brothers, are now engaged. What has brought us to these grave straits?

Are we two different races, as the new ethnologists of the South, with profound knowledge of history and of their own skins, names, and language, proclaim? Have they produced the names which Europe mentions when American literature is spoken of? Have they produced our Crawfords? Have they advanced science? Have they the great schools of the age? Do they speak the choice idiom of the cultivated man? Have the thinkers and inventors of the age their homes in that region? Is their standard of comfort exalted above that of ours? What has this wondrous race produced? what new idea has it added to the great stock of civilization? It has produced cotton, and added the idea that slavery is divine. Does this establish a superior race?

The French, ourselves, the English, the Germans, the Italians, none of whom are destitute of national self-gratulation, have ever made a prœposterous claim of constituting a different race. Even the new idea of a Latin Race—a Bonaparte anachronism—is founded upon an error less revolting to common sense and common knowledge.

There is no fact or movement of greater significance in all history of the human race, than the settlement of this great continent by European people at a period when, in their portion of the globe, great nations had been formed, and the national polity had finally become the normal type of government; and it is a fact equally pregnant with momentous results, that the northern portion of this hemisphere came to be colonized chiefly

by men who brought along with them the seeds of self-government, and a living common law, instinct with the principles of manly self-dependence and civil freedom.

The charters under which they settled, and which divided the American territory into colonies, were of little more importance than the vessels and their names in which the settlers crossed the Atlantic; nor had the origin of these charters a deep meaning, nor was their source always pure. The people in this country always felt themselves to be one people, and unitedly they proclaimed and achieved their independence. The country as a whole was called by Washington and his compeers America, for want of a more individual name. Still, there was no outward and legal bond between the colonies, except the crown of England; and when our people abjured their allegiance to that crown, each colony stood formally for itself. The Articles of Confederation were adopted, by which our forefathers attempted to establish a confederacy, uniting all that felt themselves to be of one nation, but were not one by outward legal form. It was the best united government our forefathers could think of, or of which, perhaps, the combination of circumstances admitted. Each colony came gradually to be called a State, and called itself sovereign, although none of them had ever exercised any of the highest attributes of sovereignty; nor did ever after the States do so.

Wherever political societies are leagued together, be it by the frail bonds of a pure confederacy, or by the consciousness of the people that they are intrinsically one people, and form one nation, without, however, a positive National Government, then the most powerful of these ill-united portions needs must rule and, as always more than one portion wishes to be the leader, intestine struggles ensue in all such incoherent governments. It has been so in antiquity; it has been so in the middle ages; it has been so, and is so in modern times. Athens and Sparta, Castile and Aragon, Austria and Prussia, are always jealous companions, readily turned into bitter enemies. Those of our forefathers who later became the framers of our Constitution, saw this approaching evil, and they observed many other ills which had already overtaken the confederacy. Even Washington, the strong and tenacious patriot, nearly desponded. It was a dark period in our history; and it was then that our fathers most boldly, yet most considerately, performed the greatest act that our annals record —they engrafted a national, complete and representative government on our insufficient confederacy; a government with an exclusively National executive, in which the Senate, though still representing the States as States, became Nationalized in a great measure, and in which the House of Representatives became purely National like the Executive. Virginia, which, under the Articles of Confederation, was approaching the leadership over all (in the actual assumption of which she would have been resisted by other rapidly growing states, which would inevitably have led to her Peloponnesian war)—Virginia was now represented according to her population, like every other portion of the country; not as a unit, but by a number of representatives who were bound to vote individually, according to their consciences, as National men. The danger of internal struggle and provincial bitterness had passed, and our country now fairly entered as an equal among the leading nations in the course, where

nations, like Olympic chariot-horses, draw abreast the car of civilization. We advanced rapidly; the task assigned to us by Providence was performed with a rapidity which had not been known before; for we had a National Government commensurate to our land and, it seemed, adequate to our destiny.

But while thus united and freed from provincial retardation and entanglements, a new portent appeared.

Slavery, which had been planted here in the colonial times, and which had been increased in this country, by the parent government, against the urgent protestations of the colonists, and especially of the Virginians, existed in all the colonies at the time when they declared themselves independent. It was felt by all to be an evil which must be dealt with as best it might be, and the gradual extinction of which must be wisely yet surely provided for. Even Mr. Calhoun, in his earlier days, called slavery a scaffolding erected to rear the mansion of civilization, which must be taken down when the fabric is finished.

This institution gave way gradually as civilization advanced. It has done so in all periods of history, and especially of Christian history. Slavery melts away like snow before the rays of rising civilization. The South envied the North for getting rid of slavery so easily, and often expressed her envy. But a combination of untoward circumstances led the South to change her mind. First, it was maintained that if slavery is an evil, it was their affair and no one else had a right to discuss it or to interfere with it; then it came to be maintained that it was no evil; then slavery came to be declared an important national element, which required its own distinct representation and especial protection; then it was said—we feel ashamed to mention it—that slavery is a divine institution. To use the words of the great South-Carolinian, whose death we deeply mourn—of James Louis Petigru—they placed, like the templars, Christ and Baphomet on the same altar, worshipping God and Satan simultaneously. But though slavery were divine, they choked the wells of common knowledge with sand and stones, and enacted perpetual ignorance for the slave. Then the renewal of that traffic, the records of which fills far the darkest pages of European history, and which the most strenuous and protracted efforts of civilized nations have not yet wholly succeeded in abolishing, was loudly called for; and our national laws, making that unhallowed trade piracy, were declared unconstitutional. Yet still another step was to be taken. It was proclaimed that slavery is a necessary element of a new and glorious civilization; and those who call themselves conservatives plunged recklessly into a new-fangled theory of politics and civilization.

Some thirty years ago we first heard of Southern Rights. Some twenty years since we were first made familiar with the expression, Southern Principles. Within the present lustre, Southern Civilization has been proclaimed. What else remained but to invent Southern Mathematics and to decree a Southern God? And what does *Southern* mean in this connection? *South* is a word which indicates relative position in geography. Yet, in these combinations, it refers neither to geography, nor to climate, nor to product, but singly and exclusively to Slavery. Southern Rights, Southern Principles, Southern Civilization, and Southern Honor or "Chivalry," are novel phrases, to express the new idea of

principles and civilization characterized and tested by the dependence of one class of people as chattel upon another. A more appalling confusion of ideas is not recorded in the history of any tribe or nation that has made any use of the terms—Rights, Principles, or Civilization.

Thus slavery came to group the different portions of our country; outside of, and indeed in hostility to, the National Government and National Constitution. The struggle for the leadership was upon us. The South declared openly that it must rule; we, in the meantime, declaring that the Nation must rule, and if an issue is forced upon us, between the South and the North, then, indeed, the North must rule and shall rule. *This* is the war in which we are now engaged—in which, at the moment this is read to you, the precious blood of your sons, and brothers, and fathers, is flowing.

Whenever men are led, in the downward course of error and passion, ultimately to declare themselves, with immoral courage, in favor of a thing or principle which for centuries and thousands of years their own race has declared, by a united voice, an evil or a crime, the mischief does not stop with this single declaration. It naturally, and by a well-established law, unhinges the whole morality of man; it warps his intellect, and inflames his soul, with bewildering passions, with defiance to the simplest truth and plainest fact, and with vindictive hatred toward those who cannot agree with him. It is a fearful thing to become the defiant idolater of wrong. Slavery, and the consequent separation from the rest of men, begot pride in the leading men of the South—absurdly even pretending to be of a different and better race. Pride begot bitter and venomous hatred, and this bitter hatred, coupled with the love of owning men as things, begot at last a hatred of that which distinguishes the whole race to which we belong, more than aught else—the striving for and love of liberty.

There is no room, then, for pacifying arguments with such men in arms against us, against their duty, their country, their civilization. All that remains for the present is the question, Who shall be the victor?

It is for all these reasons which have been stated, that we pledge ourselves anew, in unwavering loyalty, to stand by and support the Government in all its efforts to suppress the rebellion, and to spare no endeavor to maintain, unimpaired, the national unity, both in principle and territorial boundary.

We will support the Government, and call on it with a united voice to use greater and greater energy, as the contest may seem to draw to a close; so that whatever advantages we may gain, we may pursue them with increasing efficiency, and bring every one in the military or civil service, thal may be slow in the performance of his duty, to a quick and efficient account.

We approve of the Conscription Act, and will give our loyal aid in its being carried out, whenever the Government shall consider the increase of our army necessary; and we believe that the energy of the Government should be plainly shown by retaliatory measures, in checking the savage brutalities committed by the enemy against our men in arms, or agaiust unarmed citizens, when they fall into their hands.

We declare that slavery, the poisonous root of this war, ought to be

compressed within its narrowest feasible limits, with a view to its speedy extinction.

We declare that this is no question of politics, but one of patriotism; and we hold every one to be a traitor to his country, that works or speaks in favor of our criminal enemies, directly or indirectly, whether his offence be such that the law can overtake him or not.

We declare our inmost abhorrence of the secret societies which exist among us in favor of the rebellious enemy, and that we will denounce every participator in these nefarious conventicles, whenever known to us. We believe publicity the very basis of liberty.

We pledge our fullest support of the government in every measure which it shall deem fit to adopt against unfriendly and mischievous neutrality; and we call upon it, as citizens that have the right and duty to call for protection on their own government, to adopt the speediest possible measures to that important end.

We loyally support our government in its declarations and measures against all and every attempt of mediation, or armed or unarmed interference in our civil war.

We solemnly declare that we will resist every partition of any portion of our country to the last extremity, whether this partition should be brought about by rebellious or treasonable citizens of our own, or by foreign powers, in the way that Poland was torn to pieces.

We pronounce every foreign minister accredited to our government, who tampers with our enemies, and holds covert intercourse with disloyal men among us, as failing in his duty toward us and toward his own people, and we await with attention the action of our government regarding the recent and surprising breach of this duty.

And we call upon every American, be he such by birth or choice, to join the loyal movement of these National Leagues, which is naught else than to join and follow our beckoning flag, and to adopt for his device—

OUR COUNTRY!

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
863 BROADWAY.

No. 17.

THE CAUSE OF THE WAR:

WHO BROUGHT IT ON,

AND

FOR WHAT PURPOSE?

SPEECH OF COL. CHARLES ANDERSON,

LATE OF TEXAS,

NOW OF U. S. VOLUNTEERS.

NEW YORK:
Wm. C. Bryant & Co., Printers, 41 Nassau St., cor. Liberty.

1863.

THE CAUSE OF THE WAR.

Mr. ANDERSON being at home a short time, in Dayton, where he resides, on account of illness, and having so far recovered as to be able to speak, the Xenia Union Club improved the opportunity, and invited him to address a meeting on the 2d of May, 1863. A fine audience assembled, composed of the substantial citizens of the city and vicinity, of all party predilections, and among whom were many ladies.

The chairman, in introducing Mr. Anderson, said a formal introduction was hardly necessary, as the speaker had often appeared before Xenia audiences in times past, extending over a period of twenty-five years, but since his last appearance here, he had seen and suffered much in connection with the enemies of our country, and what he had to say to-night would be based mainly on his own personal knowledge and experience.

Mr. ANDERSON, thus presented to his audience, said:

It is true that many times, in years gone by, I have had the pleasure of addressing you, but never on an occasion like this; and I trust the time will soon come when we need no longer dwell on the sad scenes through which our country is passing. It is more than twenty-eight years since I first harangued the people of this town, and on a subject not foreign to the present—the love of the Union, and the dangers which beset it. Many then thought that the doubts and fears, which were natural to one who loved the Union as I did, were foolish and imaginary. And I think but few, if any, of us are even now waked up, after two years of war, to the great issue which is involved in the contest. I sometimes look upon human nature in dismay, to see how unduly we estimate our privileges, and how thoughtless we are of the dangers which beset us. It does even seem that the American people would not be surprised at the sound of the

angel Gabriel's trumpet, but would go right along with the ordinary affairs of life, so soon do we become familiarized with scenes of danger and the impending ruin hanging over us. For is it not true that there is a large body of the American people who have persuaded themselves that our country—I say our country, for, whatever they may say on the other side of Dixie, surely every man on this side is interested in the whole country, and still claims his right to an interest in the whole of it—is it not true that a large portion of our people, sensible enough on most subjects, have not, even now, a clear perception of the fact that this war is a contest between ourselves, for free government, and another party which is striving to destroy us, and the interests of our children, and all generations to come after us? which is endeavoring to destroy our free institutions, and everything which makes our country respectable, which makes property useful, which makes life worth the living?

OPPOSITION TO REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT.

They say it is an Abolition war—a war carried on for the purpose of abolishing slavery. Such is the character given to it by men of the South, and it is repeated by those who sympathize with their cause in the North; but, as I look at it, there is nothing in it but a simple contest between two great principles, which are utterly irreconcilable, which can no more exist together than fire and water. These principles are those of the free institutions of Republican Government and those of Absolutism. A government by one ruling head is a form of absolute power; military power is another form of absolute government; another is, the power of an aristocracy, an oligarchy, and this is the form in which absolutism presents itself in opposition to us. An oligarchy is now openly fighting our free institutions. To my view the war is now as plain as any highway; no tracks can be plainer; they are made deep in the path of history; every claw of the beast is as plain to me as the tracks of the savage wild beasts are to the experienced hunter. The principle of an oligarchical government, which is the most absolute form of absolutism, and the very worst, is engaged in a life contest with

that State, one of which requires them to use their influence in procuring an adjournment of this body to the 4th of April next. It is the wish of that State that opportunity may be given for full consideration of any Constitutional amendment that may be proposed here, and especially to avoid precipitate action under apprehensions of resistance to the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln on the 4th of next month.

I have already submitted resolutions in accordance with the views of the Legislature, and intended, at the proper time, to ask a vote upon the proposed adjournment. On consultation with my collegues, however, I find a majority of them averse to postponement; and, in view of the fact that the resolution of the Legislature is not imperative in its terms, and especially in consideration of the assurances constantly given here by delegates from Slaveholding States that, whatever may be the result of our deliberations, no obstruction or hindrance will be opposed to the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln, I have determined to forbear urging a vote.

Upon the respective merits of the propositions of the Committee, and the proposed amendments, I have not much to say. But what I do say will be said in all seriousness.

I do not approve the confident pledges made here of favorable action by the people of either section, or of any State upon whatever propositions may receive the sanction of this conference. The people of the Free States, so far as my observation goes, do not commit their right of judgment to any body. They generally exercise it themselves, and be assured they will exercise it freely upon any proposition coming from this body. Whatever our action may be here, every proposition to amend the Constitution must come before the people. They will discuss it, and must adopt it before it can become a part of the fundamental law. Dismiss, then, the idea that all that is necessary to secure amendments acceptable to a particular interest or section is to secure for them the sanction of a majority in this hall.

The result of the national canvass which recently terminated in the election of Mr. Lincoln has been spoken of by some as the effect of a sudden impulse, or of some irregular excitement of the popular mind; and it has been somewhat confidently as-

serted that, upon reflection and consideration, the hastily-formed opinions which brought about that election will be changed. It has been said also that subordinate questions of local and temporary character have augmented the Republican vote, and secured a majority which could not have been obtained upon the national questions involved in the respective platforms of the parties which divide the country.

I cannot take this view of the result of the Presidential election. I believe, and the belief amounts to absolute conviction, that the election must be regarded as a triumph of principles cherished in the hearts of the people of the Free States. These principles, it is true, were originally asserted by a small party only. But, after years of discussion, they have, by their own value, their own intrinsic soundness, obtained the deliberate and unalterable sanction of the people's judgment.

Chief among these principles is the Restriction of Slavery within State limits; *not* war upon Slavery within those limits, but fixed opposition to its extension beyond them. Mr. Lincoln was the candidate of the people opposed to the extension of Slavery. We have elected him. After many years of earnest advocacy and of severe trial, we have achieved the triumph of that principle. By a fair and unquestionable majority, we have secured that triumph. Do you think we, who represent this majority, will throw it away? Do you think the people would sustain us if we undertook to throw it away? I must speak to you plainly, gentlemen of the South. It is not in my heart to deceive you. I therefore tell you explicitly that if we of the North and West would consent to throw away all that has been gained in the recent triumph of our principles, the people would not sustain us, and so the consent would avail you nothing And I must tell you further, that under no inducements whatever will we consent to surrender a principle which we believe to be so sound and so important as that of restricting Slavery within State limits.

There are some things, however, which I think the people are willing to do. In all my relations with them, and these relations have been somewhat intimate, I have never discovered any desire or inclination on the part of any considerable number, to interfere with the institution of Slavery within the

North, for being imposed upon by admitting any doubt on this question.

What did they threaten to rebel for in 1820? Because Congress refused to give to Missouri representation for three-fifths of her slaves—to allow the people of the forthcoming new State to count three-fifths of their negro property as equal to a corresponding whole number of free white citizens in your free State of Ohio—to give to fifty thousand Missouri slaves the same political power as thirty thousand of your citizens possess who are a part of the Government. And this notwithstanding the fact that if you go back of that claim you will find—and they don't deny it themselves—that the fathers who made our Constitution never intended to have a new slave State. They contended that in those days the fathers of this Government were under a delusion—that they were not so wise as their descendants on this subject of slavery. But it is a fact that they actually limited, forever, by solemn compact, the bounds of slavery; it was not to be extended into any of the territory which the nation owned or ever expected to own. Still, they have gone on, from that starting-point, that slavery was to be restricted, and ultimately exterminated, and added slave State after slave State, purchasing land to do so, in violation of the Constitution. I don't say this on my own opinion merely; I state it on the authority of sound and indisputable Democratic statesmanship. Mr. Jefferson, the father of Democracy, admitted that the purchase of Louisiana, or the admission of any more slave territory, was unconstitutional. Notwithstanding this, the South added slave State after slave State, purchasing land unconstitutionally, while they could, and, when that method failed, turning highway robber, and assaulting a weaker power, stole from Mexico territory enough to still bring in a slave State for every free State admitted. I hope I don't give offence to my "Democratic" friends, and I don't care much if I do. [Applause and laughter.]

I said awhile ago that you ought to blush for being imposed upon with falsehoods, when the clear pages of history contradicted them; but you ought much more to blush for admitting that all this was right. Right, that in a Democratic, republican Government the minority shall forever keep even with the

majority? Right, that territory which was consecrated to freedom shall be given to slavery? Right, that, to extend slavery, which was limited by the fathers of the Government, land should be unconstitutionally obtained, and even stolen and fought for? Right, to do all this in order to allow slavery to keep even with freedom? I must admit that I am sometimes dismayed, not to say terrified, at this evidence of our unfitness for self-government.

HOW THE SOUTH HAS RULED THE NATION.

In 1820, when the South first menaced us with disunion, and before an Abolition petition had been presented, what was the account between the two sections? I reckon my Democratic friends will not deny that this was intended to be a Republican Government, in which all the States should enjoy equal rights and possess equal opportunities for filling its offices. But what was the result? In 1820 we had elected Presidents who had served thirty-six years. Of these, Washington, a slaveholder, had served eight; Jefferson, a slaveholder, eight years; Madison, a slaveholder, eight years; Monroe, a slaveholder, eight years; making a total of thirty-two years, which a minority had controlled a Republican Government, while the majority had control of it only four years, under John Adams. Such was the result in a Republican Government, where the majority is intended and ought to rule; and that result was brought about by the force of that institution in relation to which a provision was incorporated in the Constitution, allowing slave property to have a representative power in the Government. And because this oligarchical power, having ruled the nation since its organization in the proportion of thirty-two to four years demanded admissions and compromises which would secure to it a continuance of the monopoly, and was refused, it rebelled and began war upon us. And yet they make the pretence, and it is believed by some of you, that the war was brought on because some persons in the North interfered with their slave interests in their own States.

South Carolina had no more fear of the Lincoln Administration disturbing her slaves, than she had fears that I would interfere with the Government of any set of children that belongs to any wedded pair in this house. As to fugitive slaves, you know that the very States which lost their slaves by their escaping to the North, were those which shuddered at the idea of dissolution, and had to be driven to it, so far as they yielded to it at all; and those which proposed and urged secession, are the States which never lost slaves in this way at all. And, put them all together, they never lost as much property in this way as Northern farmers and manufacturers do by the ordinary destruction of the machinery they employ instead of slave-labor.

The real fact is, that all the time the purpose has been to change our Government from a Republic, in which the majority rules, to an oligarchy, where the minority rules; and slavery only became connected with the question, because they were ruling you by the influence of three-fifths of their slaves. They call me an Abolitionist now, but I don't vex myself on that account any more than I do on account of the miseries of the slaves. I know all about them; I know the evil of slavery, for I have felt it since the day I was born, and have studied it all my life. Consequently, I presume I abhor it worse than any of you. But while legitimately in the Union, I would tolerate it as I would tolerate a cancer in the heart. But, with the knowledge that there are a million of men arrayed with arms to break down my Government and your Government, and that slavery is held up as a barrier for their protection and defense, what does the cry of Abolition amount to? What is the destruction of slavery, compared with the perpetuity of the peace and prosperity of all the people of this nation for all time to come? Ask me to protect that shield, that black shield of slavery—say to me that I must turn my sword aside, and let it fall harmless before this bulwark of the enemy! It is all sheer cant and hypocrisy. No man is so depraved in his heart not to say, that though I might tolerate slavery in the Union for the sake of the Union, yet, when I am fighting the battles of the Union, and it becomes a shield of defense to treason, a weapon of

destruction to the Republic, the very principle which made me tolerate it then, would make me stamp it under foot now! [Great applause.]

I suppose I am called upon to respect the slavery of Cuba, or of Brazil, in our relations with those countries in time of peace; but, let Cuba become involved in war with us, or suppose Brazil at your throat, would you have me be so very careful of the slave interests of those countries? Certainly not; and I tell you that I would have far more respect for, and would show more forbearance toward, the slaves of Cuba, in a war with us, than I would toward the slaves of any rebel to his government, from Jeff. Davis down. [Applause.] And I tell you another truth, that no man who has an honest heart, or a natural love for his own home, his own family, and of that greater blessing for which he loves them all, his country, but must entertain the same sentiments. Away, then, with this cant of Abolitionism! It is only a sham, an empty pretence.

As to peace, which the Bible says is a good that passeth all understanding, I would be willing to endure a great deal to bring about a true and lasting peace; but as long as that people stand out against the Union, they must never come to me, a Union man—a man having no other religion than a love of Union—and ask me to withhold a blow aimed at them and theirs, slavery included.

SLAVERY THE LOSER BY DISUNION.

Does the South expect the people of the North to be so craven that, when their country is gone, their nationality lost, divided and subject to war in all the generations to come, they will be more abjectly servile than any other people on the globe? Do they expect that when they have made a foreign country of the North, it will be more forbearing of their evil than the rest of the nations of the earth? How has it been with England? do they ever get runaway negroes from her? I never heard of but one man who had so little sense as to go to Canada to recover runaway slaves, and he was a cousin of mine. [Laughter.] He laid all his traps well to catch him, and walked into his shop, where his "boy" greeted him with, "Why, God bless you! Master Charles, how is you! Sit down and let me shave you." He knew there was no danger, and he remained there.

Is there any slaveholder who does not know that every Christian nation abhors slavery, and that it will protect the fugitive against the pursuer? What insanity, therefore, for them to think of making a foreign nation on their borders! As long as I am on this side of the line—and I came here to be on this side, although I could have flourished down there as well as any of them—they never can persuade me to respect their institution of slavery in that pretended foreign country. When my native State becomes foreign to me, I am foreign to it; whenever it becomes a foreign enemy to my State of Ohio, I am a foreign enemy to it, and to every man in it, and to every interest in it, and especially to the interest of slavery. If that be Abolitionism, make the most of it. I am that kind of a Union man. [Voices: "So am I," "and I," "and I."] And so is every man who has brains and heart, I don't care who he is.

THE TYRANNY OF AN ARISTOCRACY.

Mr. Anderson then briefly sketched the domineering course of Southern statesmen, in the chain of compromises by which they compelled the North to foster their peculiar institution, and to give them the controlling influence in the government. They lived by these compromises only so long as they served their purposes, when they discarded them and demanded new ones. In the last speech of South Carolina, delivered to the nation on retiring from the halls of Congress, her representative said, You may do what you please, but you can't dispute the fact that the South has governed this country sixty out of the seventy-two years of its history. Everything indicates that their desire and determination was to rule, and ultimately to govern this country by an oligarchy.

I need not, in this discussion, say anything about our republican form of Government. But how is it with theirs? It is the meanest of all Governments. I know there are people in Ohio who talk about "States Rights," and rights based upon slavery, and who would like to have Jeff. Davis' dominions extended over them; but I want to know if the facts are not these: that the wisest writer on Government, in giving the qualities of different Governments, describes them thus: "The

strongest form of Government is in the Monarchy; the most honest, the Republic; the most cunning and most selfish, the Aristocracy?" Whenever you give to a few men special privileges—and that is the trouble in our contest with the slave States—they are seeking special privileges in regard to their slaves—when you give to any man an advantage in railroad or other corporations, they will take more special care of that interest than of any other. The slave States, having a privileged property, they are more diligent to expand it and seek for it protection, than men owning ordinary property. The nobleman stands by his badge because it is a badge, and not from its inherent worth, for the reason that it is a special privilege which only sixty out of sixty millions can wear.

Does every man not know that the most fearful tyrannies of the world are aristocracies? There is no tyranny so remorseless as this very form of government now seeking to throttle your national life. I have made some observations in regard to this form of government, having been twice to Europe, and to Asia and Africa once. I have suffered a little in the way of imprisonment; have seen considerable of the workings of absolute government in Turkey, Austria, and elsewhere; and I tell you that I have never in my life seen so unmitigated a despotism as the Government of the Confederate States. There is no government on the earth that has the power, or which uses it more remorselessly on independence of thought and action, than that of Jeff. Davis and his miserable cable of villains congregated at Richmond. For months and months, in the early stages of the rebellion, there was no freedom to oppose those who favored it. Look at the vote Texas and Louisiana gave for the Union; but what became of those thousands of Union men? It could not be possible they were all honestly converted to secession. No, they were subjugated, crushed down by the reign of terror which then existed, and has continued to exist to this day.

People are distressed here about a few arrests that have been made by the "tyrant Lincoln," and about not allowing free speech and a free press; but this is the mild restraint of a few dangerous traitors for a brief period. There is no comparison between them. How is it down yonder? There is no State,

except one, I believe, which has not dictated to the farmer what he shall sow, and plant, and reap. I tell you, my friends, you would think very differently of your Government if it should forbid your planting this crop or that, and say so much of your grain should belong to the Government; but this is what the new and better government of the South is doing. And, remember, that they are the Democracy of the country, and that those who arrogantly call themselves Democrats up here among you sympathize with them, that they may once more unite with them, and govern the country.

THE RACE BETWEEN FREEDOM AND SLAVERY.

The result of the contest between the principles of freedom and of absolutism amounts to simply this: they of the oligarchical persuasion modestly ask our people, in this race, to be handicapped. Excuse my illustration; I always try to compare everything by the horse, for he is an animal I am extremely fond of, and in days gone by was familiar with racing customs. "Handicapping" consists in equalizing the ability of horses about to run a race; that is, it is a trick by which, if your horse is twice as fast as mine, twice as much weight is put upon him as upon mine. Thus, if I should enter a mule or a jackass against your fleet horse, the game would be to put but a few pounds on the jackass, and a hundred pounds on your swift courser, so as to enable the jackass to keep up. Now, in this nineteenth century of the Christian era the plain proposition of these Southern people is, that you shall let down the educational standard of the North, your religion, your industry, your enterprise, your democratic principles, your freedom, until you shall be handicapped to the rate of speed, at which the misbegotten, rickety, blind institution of slavery can travel. [Great applause and laughter.] Is it anything else? You may state the subject, and argue the question anew, until you grow gray, and the result will be the same—they demand that you shall be handicapped and hamstrung down to their capacity to keep even with you, that the minority shall always be equal to the majority.

Mr. Anderson then referred to his experiences with the K. G. C.'s in Texas, in which they boldly admitted that this was the

nature of the contest, and proclaimed their superior qualifications, and their determination to rule. The politicians of the South—the leaders in the rebellion—unblushingly declare that free institutions have been tried and found wanting. Is this the principle that the Democracy of Ohio feel themselves bound to sympathize with, and are these the men whose peculiar rights they ask us to respect? If so, and they are ready to fight and die for them, as they declare they are, the sooner they die the better, but let it be by hanging! [Applause.]

THE RIGHT OF THE SOUTH TO GOVERN THE NORTH.

The speaker, having shown by the history of events, by the uniform conduct of the South toward the North, and by the character of the so-called Confederate Government, their disposition to rule, and to make the Government conform to their wishes, proceeded to close his remarks by substantiating his positions, from the words of a leading Southern author, who wrote in the *Southern Literary Messenger*, and who was indorsed by the conductors of the *Plantation*, the only Quarterly of the South, in which his article was republished in September, 1860. The writer says:

"A contest of *race* exists at present, between the people of this Government. The postulate, then, now sought to be established is, that the *Southern* people in the main—in other words the *representative* blood of the South—comes of that branch of the human race which, at this time, controls all the enlightened nations of the earth." "That stand-point is to be found, and we think only to be found, in the *ethnological superiority* of that race to which the Southern people, in the main, belong, their particular capacity for *executive control* and ther control of this particular institution of slavery." "The Puritans, at home, constituted, as a class, the common people of England. * * * But, so little of that, which it pleases us to speak of as *executive capacity* did they possess, that after the death of Cromwell there seemed to be left nothing of the element of control; * * * the result of which was a peaceful relapse of the whole people into their former subjection to the Norman rule."

Speaking of the Northern people, the descendants of these Puritans, the writer says:

"*Being inherently destitute of capacity for control, they are unable to imbue their legislation with those elements which command obedience.* * * * On the contrary, the *Southern* mind, when left to its normal working, is disposed to quiet and to gentleness, coming to conclusions by the almost instinctive application of the simplest rules; yet, when roused to action, capable of almost incredible effort, and equal to the highest flight of genius. Naturally generous, Southerners exercise much forbearance, till the question of honor is raised, and then they rush to the sword; accustomed to enforce obedience when it is due, they readily yield it when their position and duty require it; fierce and fearless in a contest, yet just, generous and gentle in command, *they possess every quality necessary* to rule the Northern people. * * The Northern people have many great traits of character and intellect, * * still *they require control*, and the Southern people of this country possess the capacity, the position and the power to do so, if they are only true to themselves."

This *capacity* of the Southern people to rule, says the writer, comes from the fact that "the Southern States were settled and governed, in a great measure, under the supervision of the *Crown*, immediately by and under the direction of persons belonging to the blood and race of the reigning family, and belonged to that stock recognized as CAVALIERS, who were the royalists in the time of Charles I. The Southern people come of that race, who, to-day, sit upon all the thrones of enlightened Europe, and give law to the millions. They are of that race who have established law, order, and government over the earth. They come of that race to whom law and order, obedience and command, are convertible terms, and who *do* command, the world over, whether the subject be African or Caucasion, Celt or Saxon."

Now, a thought or two and I will close. With these claims of a natural right of race and blood to rule the people of the North, they have what? The sympathy of that portion of the people of the North calling themseves Democrats. Is this Democracy? It is not Democracy of better days; it is not the

Democracy of Jackson, but the spurious sentiment of Calhoun, who stole the name with which to christen his own anti-republican notions.

I end as I began. This contest is actual war; it is a conflict between republican freedom and the assumption of an oligarchy to rule over us. Shall I sympathize with them? Shall I forbear toward them? Never while powder will inflame, lead be made to fly, or steel to cut. I would as soon spare an adder's fangs. You call this cruelty? It is the cruelty which made martyrs of the early Christian fathers; it made heroes of our Revolutionary fathers. Sacrifice? Sacrifice everything rather than submit yourselves slaves. Suffer? Suffer all, rather than descend from freedom to become menials and serfs to heartless masters. Others may do differently, but I shall be slow to believe there are many on this side of the line who will stand out, in action, word, or sympathy, when they understand all the truth, for the oligarchy of the South.

☞ *Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No. 863 Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.*

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
863 BROADWAY.

No. 18.

Opinions of the Early Presidents,

AND OF THE

FATHERS OF THE REPUBLIC,

UPON

SLAVERY,

AND UPON

NEGROES AS MEN AND SOLDIERS.

NEW YORK:
WM. C. BRYANT & CO., PRINTERS, 41 NASSAU STREET, CORNER OF LIBERTY.

1863.

A READING ON SLAVERY,

FROM THE

EARLY PRESIDENTS.

Prepared for the Celebration of Washington's Birthday at Lyceum Hall, Salem, February 22, 1863.

GEORGE WASHINGTON.—1*st President.*

April 12, 1786, to Robert Morris:

"I hope it will not be conceived, from these observations, that it is my wish to hold the unhappy people who are the subject of this letter in slavery. I can only say, that there is not a man living who wishes more sincerely than I do, to see a plan adopted for the abolition of it."

Sep. 9, 1786, to John F. Mercer.

"I never mean, unless some particular circumstance should compel me to it, to possess another slave by purchase, it being among my first wishes to see some plan adopted by which slavery in this country may be abolished by law."

To Sir John Sinclair, 11th December, 1796:

"The present prices of lands in Pennsylvania are higher than they are in Maryland and Virginia, although they are not of superior quality; (among other reasons) because there are laws here for the gradual abolition of slavery, which neither of the two States above mentioned have at present, but which nothing is more certain than they must have, and at a period not remote."

The 5th of February, 1783, Lafayette writes:

"Now, my dear General, that you are going to enjoy some ease and quiet, permit me to propose a plan to you, which might become greatly beneficial to the black part of mankind. Let us unite in purchasing a small estate, where we may try the experiment to free the negroes, and use them only as ten

ants. Such an example as yours might render it a general practice; and, if we succeed in America, I will cheerfully devote a part of my time to render the method fashionable in the West Indies. If it be a wild scheme, I had rather be mad in this way, than to be thought wise in the other task."—*Correspondence of the American Revolution*, vol. iii , p. 547.

To this letter Washington replies, April 5th, 1783:

"The scheme, my dear Marquis, which you propose as a precedent to encourage the emancipation of the black people in this country from that state of bondage in which they are held, is a striking evidence of the benevolence of your heart. I shall be happy to join you in so laudable a work, but will defer going into a detail of the business till I have the pleasure of seeing you."—*Sparks' Washington*, vol. viii., pp. 414, 415.

"Mount Vernon, 10th May, 1786.

"The benevolence of your heart, my dear Marquis, is so conspicuous upon all occasions, that I never wonder at any fresh proofs of it; but your late purchase of an estate in the colony of Cayenne, with a view of emancipating the slaves on it, is a generous and noble proof of your humanity. Would to God a like spirit might diffuse itself generally into the minds of the people of this country! But I despair of seeing it. Some petitions were presented to the Assembly, at its last session, for the abolition of slavery; but they could scarcely obtain a reading. To set the slaves afloat at once would, I really believe, be productive of much inconvenience and mischief, but by degrees it certainly might, and assuredly ought to be effected, and that, too, by legislative authority."

John Adams.—*2d President*

His sentiments on the subject of slavery are well known. They are well summed up in the language of a letter to Robert I. Evans, June, 1819:

"Every measure of prudence, therefore, ought to be assumed for the eventual total extirpation of slavery from the United States.

"I have, through my whole life, held the practice of slavery in such abhorrence, that I have never owned a negro or any other slave; though I have lived for many years in times when the practice was not disgraceful; when the best men in my vicinity thought it not inconsistent with their character; and when it has cost me thousands of dollars for the labor and sub-

sistence of free men, which I might have saved by the purchase of negroes at times when they were very cheap."— *Works of John Adams*, vol. x., p. 380.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.—*3d President.*

From Mr. Jefferson's Original Draft of the Declaration of Independence.

He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him; captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of Infidel Powers, is the warfare of the Christian King of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where men should be bought and sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or restrain this execrable commerce.

From Mr. Jefferson's Minutes of Debates in 1776, *on the Declaration of Independence, published with the Madison Papers.*

The clause, too, reprobating the enslaving of the inhabitants of Africa was struck out, in compliance to South Carolina and Georgia, who had never attempted to restrain the importation of slaves, and who, on the contrary, still wished to continue it. Our northern brethren, also, I believe, felt a little tender under those censures; for, though their people have very few slaves themselves, yet they had been pretty considerable carriers of them to others.

1781. *From Notes on Virginia.*

There must, doubtless, be an unhappy influence on the manners of our people, produced by the existence of slavery among us. The whole commerce between master and slave is a perpetual exercise of the most boisterous passions—the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submissions on the other. Our children see this, and learn to imitate it; for man is an imitative animal. This quality is the germ of all education in him. From his cradle to his grave, he is learning to do what he sees others do. If a parent could find no motive, either in his philanthropy or his self-love, for restraining the intemperance of passion towards his slave, it should

always be a sufficient one that his child is present. But generally it is not sufficient. The parent storms, the child looks on, catches the lineaments of wrath, puts on the same airs in the circle of similar slaves, gives a loose rein to the worst of passions; and, thus nursed, educated, and daily exercised in tyranny, cannot but be stamped by it with odious peculiarities. The man must be a prodigy who can restrain his manners and morals undepraved by such circumstances. And with what execration should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one-half the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots, and these into enemies; destroys the morals of the one part, and the *amor patriæ* of the other; for if a slave can have a country in this world, it must be any other in preference to that in which he is born to live and labor for another; in which he must lock up the faculties of his nature; contribute, as far as depends on his individual endeavors, to the evanishment of the human race; or entail his own miserable condition on the endless generations proceeding from him. With the morals of the people, their industry also is destroyed; for, in a warm climate, no man will labor for himself who can make another labor for him. This is so true, that of the proprietors of slaves a very small proportion, indeed, are even seen to labor. And can the liberties of a nation be thought secure, when we have removed their only firm basis—a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God? that they are not to be violated but with his wrath? Indeed, I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just; that his justice cannot sleep forever; that, considering numbers, nature, and natural means, only, a revolution of the wheel of fortune, an exchange of situation, is among possible events; that it may become probable by supernatural interference! The Almighty has no attribute which can take side with us in such a contest. But it is impossible to be temperate and to pursue this subject through the various considerations of policy, of morals, of history, natural and civil. We must be contented to hope they will force their way into every one's mind. I think a change already perceptible, since the origin of the present Revolution. The spirit of the master is abating, that of the slave rising from the dust, his condition mollifying, the way I hope preparing, under the auspices of Heaven, for a total emancipation; and that this is disposed, in the order of events, to be with the consent of the masters, rather than by their extirpation.

And again, speaking of the negro:

Whether further observation will or will not verify the con-

jecture, that nature has been less bountiful to them in the endowments of the head, I believe that in those of the heart she will be found to have done them justice. That disposition to theft with which they have been branded, must be ascribed to their situation, and not to any depravity of the moral sense. The man in whose favor no laws of property existed, probably feels himself less bound to respect those made in favor of others. When arguing for ourselves, we lay it down as a fundamental, that laws, to be just, must give a reciprocation of right; that without this, they are mere arbitrary rules of conduct, founded in force, and not in conscience; and it is a problem which I give the master to solve, whether the religious precepts against the violation of property were not framed for him as well as his slave? And whether the slave may not as justifiably take a little from one who has taken all from him, as he may slay one who would slay him? That a change in the relations in which a man is placed should change his ideas of moral right or wrong, is neither new nor peculiar to the color of the blacks. Homer tells us it was so 2,600 years ago.

> Jove fix'd it certain, that whatever day
> Makes man a slave, takes half his worth away.

But the slaves of which Homer speaks were whites. Notwithstanding these considerations, which must weaken their respect for the laws of property, we find among them numerous instances of the most rigid integrity, and as many as among their better instructed masters, of benevolence, gratitude, and unshaken fidelity. The opinion that they are inferior in the faculties of reason and imagination, must be hazarded with great diffidence.

1786. *To a Friend in France.*

What a stupendous, what an incomprehensible machine is man! who can endure toil, famine, stripes, imprisonment, and death itself, in vindication of his own liberty, and the next moment be deaf to all those motives whose power supported him through his trial, and inflict on his fellow-men a bondage, one hour of which is fraught with more misery than ages of that which he rose in rebellion to oppose. But we must await, with patience, the workings of an overruling Providence, and hope that that is preparing the deliverance of those our suffering brethren. When the measure of their tears shall be full, when their groans shall have involved heaven itself in darkness, doubtless a God of Justice will awaken to their distress, and, by diffusing light and liberality among ther oppressors, or at length by his exterminating thunder, manifest his attention to the things of this world, and that they are not left to the guidance of a blind fatality.

James Madison.—*4th President.*

From Mr. Madison's Report of Debates in the Federal Convention.

Mr. Madison: We have seen the mere distinction of color made, in the most enlightened period of time, a ground of the most oppressive dominion ever exercised by man over man.

Mr. Madison: And, in the third place, where slavery exists, the republican theory becomes still more fallacious.

MR. MADISON THOUGHT IT WRONG TO ADMIT, IN THE CONSTITUTION, THE IDEA THAT THERE COULD BE PROPERTY IN MEN.

Mr. Madison to Joseph Jones.—[Extract.]

PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 28, 1780.

Yours of the 18th came yesterday. I am glad to find the Legislature persist in their resolution to recruit their line of the army for the war; though without deciding on the expediency of the mode under their consideration, would it not be as well to liberate and make soldiers at once of the blacks themselves, as to make them instruments for enlisting white soldiers? It would certainly be more consonant with the principles of liberty, which ought never to be lost sight of in a contest for liberty.

James Monroe.—*5th President.*

Extract of a speech from Ex-President Monroe, delivered in the Virginia State Convention for altering the Constitution, Nov. 2d, 1829.

"What has been the leading spirit of this State, ever since our independence was obtained? She has always declared herself in favor of the equal rights of man. The revolution was conducted on that principle. Yet there was at that time a slavish population in Virginia. We hold it in the condition in which the revolution found it, and what can be done with this population?

"Sir, what brought us together in the revolutionary war? It was the doctrine of equal rights. Each part of the country encouraged and supported every other part of it. None took

advantage of the others' distresses. And if we find that this evil has preyed upon the vitals of the Union, and has been prejudicial to all the States where it has existed, *and is likewise repugnant to their several State Constitutions and Bills of Rights*, why may we not expect that they will unite with us in accomplishing its removal? If we make the attempt, and cannot accomplish it, the effect will at least be to abate the great number of petitions and memorials which are continually pouring in upon the Government. This matter is before the nation, and the principles and consequences involved in it are of the highest importance. But, in the meanwhile, self-preservation demands of us union in our councils.

"What was the origin of our slave population? The evil commenced when we were in our colonial state, but acts were passed by our colonial Legislature, prohibiting the importation of more slaves into the colony. These were rejected by the Crown. We declared our independence, and the prohibition of a further importation was among the first acts of State sovereignty. Virginia was the first State which instructed her delegates to declare the Colonies independent. She braved all dangers. From Quebec to Boston, and from Boston to Savannah, Virginia shed the blood of her sons. No imputation, then, can be cast upon her in this matter. *She did all that was in her power to do, to prevent the extension of slavery, and to mitigate its evils.*"

The views of slavery entertained by JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, *6th President of the United States*, are too familiar to be quoted.

This Reading from the Presidents closes with the Proclamations of Gen. JACKSON, *7th President*, inviting the negroes of Louisiana to arms in 1814.

HEADQUARTERS, 7TH MILITARY DISTRICT,
MOBILE, Sept. 21, 1814.

To the Free Colored Inhabitants of Louisiana.

Through a mistaken policy, you have heretofore been deprived of a participation in the glorious struggle for national rights in which our country is engaged. This no longer shall exist.

As sons of freedom, you are now called upon to defend our most inestimable blessing. As Americans, your country looks with confidence to her adopted children for a valorous support, as a faithful return for the advantages enjoyed under her mild and equitable government. As fathers, husbands, and brothers, you are summoned to rally around the standard of the Eagle, to defend all which is dear in existence.

Your country, although calling for your exertions, does not wish you to engage in her cause without amply remunerating you for the services rendered. Your intelligent minds are not to be led away by false representations. Your love of honor would cause you to despise the man who should attempt to deceive you. In the sincerity of a soldier and the language of truth I address you.

To every noble-hearted, generous freeman of color, volunteering to serve during the present contest with Great Britain, and no longer, there will be paid the same bounty, in money and lands, now received by the white soldiers of the United States, viz., one hundred and twenty-four dollars in money, and one hundred and sixty acres of land. The non-commissioned officers and privates will also be entitled to the same monthly pay and daily rations, and clothes, furnished to any American soldier.

On enrolling yourselves in companies, the Major-General commanding will select officers for your government from your white fellow-citizens. Your non-commissioned officers will be appointed from among yourselves.

Due regard will be paid to the feelings of freemen and soldiers. You will not, by being associated with white men in the same corps, be exposed to improper comparisons or unjust sarcasm. As a distinct, independent battalion or regiment, pursuing the path of glory, you will, undivided, receive the applause and gratitude of your countrymen.

To assure you of the sincerity of my intentions, and my anxiety to engage your invaluable services to our country, I have communicated my wishes to the governor of Louisiana, who is fully informed as to the manner of enrolment, and will give you every necessary information on the subject of this address.

ANDREW JACKSON,
Major-General Commanding.

General Jackson's Address to the "Men of Color," on the 18th of December, 1814, at New Orleans.

Soldiers: From the shores of Mobile I collected you to arms. I invited you to share the perils and to divide the glory of your white countrymen. I expected much from you, for I was not uninformed of those qualities which must render you so formidable to an invading foe. I knew that you could endure hunger and thirst, and all the hardships of war. I knew that you loved the land of your nativity, and that, like ourselves, you had to defend all that is most dear to man. *But you surpass my hopes. I have found in you, united to these qualities, that noble enthusiasm which impels to great deeds.*

Soldiers: The President of the United States shall be informed of your conduct on the present occasion, and the voice of the representatives of the American nation shall applaud your valor, as your general now praises your ardor. The enemy is near: his "sails cover the lakes:" but the brave are united, and if he finds us contending among ourselves, it will be for the prize of valor and fame, its noblest reward.

By command,

Thos. L. Butler,
Aid de Camp.

(See Niles' Register, Vol. VII., p. 346.)

A Private Letter Written by General Jackson, *on the 1st of May*, 1833, *to Rev.* A. J. Crawford.

"I have had a laborious task here; but nullification is dead, and its actors and courtiers will only be remembered by the people to be execrated for their wicked designs to sever and destroy the only good government on the globe, and that prosperity and happiness we enjoy over every other portion of the world. Haman's gallows ought to be the fate of all such ambitious men, who would involve the country in civil war, and all the evils in its train, that they might reign and ride on its whirlwinds, and direct the storm. The free people of these United States have spoken, and consigned these demagogues to their proper doom. Take care of your nullifiers you have amongst you. Let them meet the indignant frowns of every man who loves his country. The tariff, it is now known, was a mere pretext, and disunion and a Southern Confederacy the real object. The next pretext will be the negro, or the slavery question."

WHAT THE FATHERS THOUGHT OF THE BLACKS AS SLAVES, AS SOLDIERS, AND AS MEN.

A reading prepared for the celebration of Washington's birth-day at Lyceum Hall, Salem, Massachusetts, A. D. 1863.

An address to the Public, from the Pennsylvania Society for promoting the abolition of slavery, and the relief of free negroes unlawfully held in bondage.

It is with peculiar satisfaction we assure the friends of humanity, that in prosecuting the design of our association, our endeavors have proved successful, far beyond the most sanguine expectations.

Encouraged by this success, and by the daily progress of that luminous and benign spirit of liberty which is diffusing itself throughout the world, and humbly hoping for the continuance of the divine blessing on our labors, we have ventured to make an important addition to our original plan, and do therefore earnestly solicit the support and assistance of all who can feel the tender emotions of sympathy and compassion, or relish the exalted pleasure of benevolence.

Slavery is such an atrocious debasement of human nature, that its very extirpation, if not performed with solicitous care, may sometimes open a source of serious evil.

The unhappy man, who has long been treated as a brute animal, too frequently sinks beneath the common standard of the human species. The galling chains that bind his body, do also fetter his intellectual faculties, and impair the social affections of his heart. Accustomed to move like a mere machine, by the will of a master, reflection is suspended; he has not the power of choice, and reason and conscience have but little influence over his conduct, because he is chiefly governed by the passion of fear. He is poor and friendless, perhaps worn out by extreme labor, age, and disease.

Under such circumstances, freedom may often prove a misfortune to himself, and prejudicial to society.

Attention to emancipated black people, it is therefore to be hoped, will become a branch of our national police; but so far as we contribute to promote this emancipation, so far that attention is evidently a serious duty incumbent on us, and which we mean to discharge to the best of our judgment and abilities.

To instruct, to advise, to qualify those who have been restored to freedom, for the exercise and enjoyment of civil liberty, to

promote in them habits of industry, to furnish them with employments suited to their age, sex, talents, and other circumstances, and to procure their children an education calculated for their future situation in life—these are the great outlines of the annexed plan, which we have adopted, and which we conceive will essentially promote the public good, and the happiness of these our hitherto too much neglected fellow-creatures.

Signed, by order of the Society,

B. Franklin,
President.

Philadelphia, November 9, 1789.

The last public act of Franklin's life was the signing, as President of the same society, of the following memorial to Congress. The society was as old as 1774—the first of the kind in the country.

"The memorial respectfully showeth,—

"That, from a regard for the happiness of mankind, an association was formed several years since in this State, by a number of her citizens, of various religious denominations, for promoting the abolition of slavery, and for the relief of those unlawfully held in bondage. A just and acute conception of the true principles of liberty, as it spread through the land, produced accessions to their numbers, many friends to their cause and a legislative co-operation with their views, which, by the blessing of Divine Providence, have been successfully directed to the relieving from bondage a large number of their fellow creatures of the African race. They have also the satisfaction to observe that, in consequence of that spirit of philanthropy and genuine liberty which is generally diffusing its beneficial influence, similar institutions are forming at home and abroad.

"That mankind are all formed by the same Almighty Being, alike objects of his care, and equally designed for the enjoyment of happiness, the Christian religion teaches us to believe, and the political creed of Americans fully coincides with the position. Your memorialists, particularly engaged in attending to the distresses arising from slavery, believe it their indispensable duty to present this subject to your notice. They have observed, with real satisfaction, that many important and salutary powers are vested in you for 'promoting the welfare and securing the blessings of liberty to the people of the United States;' and as they conceive that these blessings ought rightfully to be administered, without distinction of color, to all descriptions of people, so they indulge themselves in the pleasing expectation, that nothing which can be done for the relief of the unhappy objects of their care, will be either omitted or delayed.

"From a persuasion that equal liberty was originally the portion, and is still the birthright of all men; and influenced by the strong ties of humanity, and the principles of their institution, your memorialists conceive themselves bound to use all justifiable endeavors to loosen the bands of slavery, and promote a general enjoyment of the blessings of freedom. Under these impressions, they earnestly entreat your serious attention to the subject of slavery, that you will be pleased to countenance the restoration of liberty to those unhappy men, who, alone in this land of freedom, are degraded into perpetual bondage, and who, amidst the general joy of surrounding freemen, are groaning in servile subjection; that you will devise means for removing this inconsistency from the character of the American people; that you will promote mercy and justice towards this distressed race; and that you will step to the very verge of the power vested in you for discouraging every species of traffic in the persons of our fellow-men.

"BENJ. FRANKLIN, *President.*

"Philadelphia, February 3, 1790."

(Annals of Congress, vol. ii., p. 1197.)

Lafayette said, "I would never have drawn my sword in the cause of America, could I have conceived that thereby I was founding a land of Slavery."

In his letter to John Adams in 1786, occur these words:

"In the cause of my black brethren, I feel myself warmly interested, and most decidedly side, so far as respects them, against the white part of mankind. Whatever be the complexion of the enslaved, it does not, in my opinion, alter the complexion of the crime which the enslaver commits—a crime much blacker than any African face. It is to me a matter of great anxiety and concern, to find that this trade is sometimes perpetrated under the flag of liberty, our dear and noble stripes, to which virtue and glory have been constant standard-bearers." —*Life and Works of John Adams*, vol. viii., p. 376.

John Randolph's will contains these words:

"I give to my slaves their freedom, to which my conscience tells me they are justly entitled. It has long been a matter of the deepest regret to me, that the circumstances under which I inherited them, and the obstacles thrown in the way by the laws of the land, have prevented my emancipating them in my lifetime, which it is my full intention to do, in case I can accomplish it."

The Virginia State Convention of 1774, resolved that

For the most trifling reasons, and sometimes for no conceiva-

ble reasons at all, his Majesty has rejected laws of the most salutary tendency. The abolition of domestic slavery is the greatest object of desire in these colonies where it was introduced in their infant state. But, previous to the enfranchisement of the slaves we have, it is necessary to exclude all further importations from *Africa*. Yet our repeated attempts to effect this by prohibitions, and by imposing duties which might amount to a prohibition, have been hitherto defeated by his Majesty's negative; thus preferring the immediate advantages of a few *African* corsairs to the lasting interests of the *American* States, and to the rights of human nature, deeply wounded by this infamous practice.

John Jay, 1st Chief Justice of the United States, writes, while minister to Spain, of the abolition of slavery:

"Till America comes into this measure, her prayers to Heaven will be impious. This is a strong expression, but I believe it is just. I believe that God governs the world, and I believe it to be a maxim in His, as in our courts, that those who ask for equity ought to do equity."

Roger B. Taney, the present Chief Justice of the United States, was called upon, in 1819, to defend Rev. Jacob Gruber, a minister of the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who was tried in the Frederick County Court, Maryland, for "attempting to excite insubordination and insurrection among slaves," by preaching a sermon in which he set forth the evils of slavery and the duties of masters. In his argument, Mr. Taney said:

"Mr. Gruber did quote the language of our great act of National Independence, and insisted on the principles contained in that venerated instrument. He did rebuke those masters who, in the exercise of power, are deaf to the calls of humanity; and he warned them of the evils they might bring upon themselves. He did speak with abhorrence of those reptiles who live by trading in human flesh, and enrich themselves by tearing the husband from the wife, the infant from the bosom of the mother; and this I am instructed was the head and front of his offending. Shall I content myself with saying he had a right to do this? that there is no law to punish him? So far is he from being the object of punishment in any form of proceedings, that we are prepared to maintain the same principles, and to use, if necessary, the same language here in the temple of justice, and in the presence of those who are the ministers of the law. A hard necessity, indeed, compels us to endure the evils

of slavery for a time. It was imposed upon us by another nation, while we were yet in a state of colonial vassalage. It cannot be easily or suddenly removed. Yet while it continues, *it is a blot on our national character*, and every real lover of freedom confidently hopes that it will be effectually, though it will be gradually, wiped away; and earnestly looks for the means by which this necessary object may be best attained. And until it shall be accomplished, until the time shall come when we can point, without a blush, to the language held in the Declaration of Independence, every friend of humanity will seek to lighten the galling chain of slavery, and better, to the utmost of his power, the wretched condition of the slave. Such was Mr. Gruber's object in that part of his sermon of which I am now speaking. Those who have complained of him, and reproached him, will not find it easy to answer him; unless complaints, reproaches, and persecution shall be considered an answer."

Alexander Hamilton wrote to an American Tory, in 1774:

"The fundamental source of all your errors, sophisms, and false reasonings, is a total ignorance of the natural rights of mankind—were you once to become acquainted with these, you could never entertain a thought that all men are not by nature entitled to equal privileges. You would be convinced that natural liberty is a gift of a beneficent Creator to the whole human race; and that civil liberty is founded on that."

And to John Jay:

"Headquarters, March 14, 1779.

"To John Jay:

"Dear Sir,—Col. Laurens, who will have the honor of delivering you this letter, is on his way to South Carolina, on a project which I think, from the present state of affairs there, is a very good one and deserves every kind of support and encouragement. This is, to raise two, three, or four battalions of negroes, with the assistance of the Government of that State, by contributions from the owners, in proportion to the number they possess. If you should think proper to enter into the subject with him, he will give you a detail of his plan. He wishes to have it recommended by Congress to the State; and, as an inducement, that they should engage to take these battalions into Continental pay.

"It appears to me, that an expedient of this kind in the present state of Southern affairs, is the most rational that can be adopted, and promises very important advantages. Indeed, I hardly see how a sufficient force can be collected in that quarter without it; and the enemy's operations there are growing

infinitely more serious and formidable. I have not the least doubt that the negroes will make very excellent soldiers with proper management; and I will venture to pronounce, that they cannot be put into better hands than those of Mr. Laurens. He has all the zeal, intelligence, enterprise, and every other qualification necessary to succeed in such an undertaking. It is a maxim with some great military judges, that, with sensible officers, soldiers can hardly be too stupid; and, on this principle, it is thought that the Russians would make the best troops in the world, if they were under other officers than their own. The King of Prussia is among the number who maintain this doctrine, and has a very emphatic saying on the occasion, which I do not exactly recollect. I mention this, because I hear it frequently objected to the scheme of embodying negroes, that they are too stupid to make soldiers. This is so far from appearing to me a valid objection, that I think their want of cultivation (for their natural faculties are probably as good as ours), joined to that habit of subordination which they acquire from a life of servitude, will make them sooner become soldiers than our white inhabitants. Let officers be men of sense and sentiment; and the nearer the soldiers approach to machines, perhaps the better.

"I foresee that this project will have to combat much opposition from prejudice and self-interest. The contempt we have been taught to entertain for the blacks makes us fancy many things that are founded neither in reason nor experience; and an unwillingness to part with property of so valuable a kind will furnish a thousand arguments to show the impracticability or pernicious tendency of a scheme which requires such a sacrifice. But it should be considered, that, if we do not make use of them in this way, the enemy probably will; and that the best way to counteract the temptations they will hold out will be to offer them ourselves. An essential part of the plan is to give them their freedom with their muskets. This will secure their fidelity, animate their courage, and, I believe, will have a good effect upon those who remain, by opening a door to their emancipation. This circumstance, I confess, has no small weight in inducing me to wish the success of the project; for the dictates of humanity, and true policy, equally interest me in favor of this unfortunate class of men.

"With the truest respect and esteem,

"I am, sir, your most obed't serv't,

"ALEX. HAMILTON."

A single passage from Mr. Bancroft's History, will give a succinct and clear account of the condition of the army, in re-

spect to colored soldiers, at the time of the battle of Bunker Hill:

"Nor should history forget to record, that as in the army at Cambridge, so also in this gallant band, the free negroes of the Colony had their representatives. For the right of free negroes to bear arms in the public defence was, at that day, as little disputed in New England as their other rights. They took their place, not in a separate corps, but in the ranks with the white man; and their names may be read on the pension rolls of the country, side by side with those of other soldiers of the Revolution."

Mr. Everett has described Peter Salem, a black man, and once a slave, as having been among the most prominent and meritorious characters at the battle of Bunker's Hill. Indeed, the historical painting of that scene, by Col. Trumbull, an eye-witness, done in 1785, gives Peter Salem, with other black patriots, a conspicuous place. One of the latter is thus commemorated:

"*To the Honorable General Court of the Massachusetts Bay:*

"The subscribers beg leave to report to your Honorable House (which we do in justice to the character of so brave a man), that, under our own observation, we declare that a negro man, called Salem Poor, of Col. Frye's regiment, Capt. Ames' company, in the late battle at Charlestown, behaved like an experienced officer, as well as an excellent soldier. To set forth particulars of his conduct would be tedious. We would beg leave to say, in the person of this said negro, centres a brave and gallant soldier. The reward due to so great and distinguished a character, we submit to the Congress.

"Jona. Brewer, Col.
Thomas Nixon, Lt. Col.
Wm. Prescott, Col.
Ephm. Corey, Lieut.
Joseph Baker, Lieut.
Jonas Richardson, Capt.
Eliphalet Bodwell, Segt.
Josiah Foster, Lieut.
Ebenr. Varnum, 2d Lieut.
Wm. Hudson Ballard, Capt.
William Smith, Capt.
John Morton, Sergt. [?]
Lieut. Richard Welsh.

"Cambridge, Dec. 5, 1755.

"In Council, Dec. 21, 1775.—Read, and sent down.

"PEREZ MORTON,

"Dep'y Sec'y."

Patrick Henry was the leading opponent, in America, of the adoption of our present Constitution. In a debate on the question of ratifying or rejecting it in the Virginia State Convention, he used, in opposing it, these strangely prophetic words—with which the reading from the Fathers closes:

"Among ten thousand implied powers which they may assume, they may, if we be engaged in war, liberate every one of your slaves, if they please. And this must and will be done by men, a majority of whom have not a common interest with you. They will, therefore, have no feeling for your interest. It has been repeatedly said here, that the great object of a National Government was national defence. If you give power to the General Government to provide for the general defence, the means must be commensurate to the end. All the means in the possession of the people must be given to the Government which is intrusted with the public defence. In this State there are 236,000 blacks, and there are many in several other States; but there are few or none in the Northern States. May Congres not say *that every black man must fight?* Did we not see a little of this last war? We were not so hard pushed as to make emancipation general: but acts of Assembly passed, that every slave who would go the Army should be free. Another thing will contribute to bring this event about: slavery is detested—we feel its fatal effects—we deplore it with all the pity of humanity. Let all these considerations, at some future period, press with full force on the minds of Congress. Let that humanity which I trust will distinguish America, and the necessity of national defence—let all these things operate on their minds; they will search that paper, and see if they have power of manumission. And have they not, sir? Have they not power to provide for the general defence and welfare? May they not think that these call for the abolition of slavery? May not they pronounce all slaves free, and will they not be warranted by that power? There is no ambiguous implication or logical deduction. The paper speaks to the point. They have the power, in clear, unequivocal terms, and will clearly and certainly exercise it."

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
863 Broadway.

No. 19.

Einheit und Freiheit.

„Ein einiges deutsches Vaterland!" — Bei welchem Deutschen, wäre er auch noch so tief in das Getriebe selbischen Strebens versunken, wäre er den Erinnerungen an das Land seiner Geburt noch so sehr entfremdet, erweckt nicht dieses Wort freudige-wehmüthige Empfindungen? Ein einiges, freies, starkes Vaterland, auf dessen Flagge seine Söhne in den fernsten Weltgegenden mit Stolz verweisen könnten, dessen Größe und Ansehen jedem Deutschen auch in der Fremde die höfliche Achtung sichern würde, deren der Engländer oder der Franzose sich erfreut: — ein solches einiges, freies Vaterland hat der Deutsche nie gehabt; es ist der Gegenstand seiner Wünsche und Sehnsucht geblieben. Und nirgends vermißt er es bitterer, schmerzlicher, als wenn er bei einem fremden Volke eine Heimath sucht. In der Fremde erst erschließt sich ihm die Erkenntniß, wie viel jedem Einzelnen das Bewußtsein werth ist, einer großen und starken Nation anzugehören.

In Amerika sind Millionen von Deutschen dieses Bewußtseins theilhaftig geworden. Mit Stolz und Freude haben sie sich deutsche Amerikaner genannt. Die Jugenderinnerungen an das Land ihrer Kindheit lieb und werth haltend, haben sie doch das Land ihrer Wahl als ihre eigentliche Heimath, als das Vaterland ihrer Kinder lieben gelernt. So gedenkt der Mann gern mit Rührung seines Kinderlebens im Elternhause, während doch sein Wesen, Denken und Empfinden in dem Heimwesen wurzeln, das er sich und dem Weibe seiner Wahl begründet hat. Wohl haben viele Deutsche eine Reihe von Jahren dazu gebraucht, um sich mit ihrem Denken und Streben auf amerikanischem Boden anzuwurzeln; wohl haben viele von ihnen sich erst nach manchen bittern Enttäuschungen und Aergernissen in die veränderten Lebensverhältnisse eingewöhnt. Aber selbst unter diesen giebt es nur Wenige, die nicht in viel höherem Grade Amerikaner wären, als sie selbst es glauben. Sie erfahren es erst, wenn ein Besuch in ihrem Geburtslande ihnen das ganze schmerzliche Elend und die Jämmerlichkeit der deutschen Zerrissenheit und Kleinstaaterei vor Augen führt. — Dann schwindet ihre Amerikamüdigkeit rasch dahin, und sie, die sich vielleicht Glück dazu gewünscht hatten, ein Land zu verlassen, mit dessen Sitten und Gebräuchen sie in so bitterm Hader gelebt, nennen sich dann gern und

mit Stolz Amerikaner. Sie erkennen, was die große Masse der deutschen Amerikaner auch ohne solche Probe erfahren hat, daß es eine Ehre und Freude ist, Theil eines großen, mächtigen Staatswesens zu sein, an dessen Flagge sich überall, wohin sie dringt, die Vorstellung knüpft, daß sie ein sicherer Schutz und Schirm für jeden Angehörigen der Nation ist.

Nicht um Bürger eines einzelnen Staats oder einer Stadt zu werden, kamen Deutsche hieher; nicht New-Yorker, Wisconsiner, Missourier oder Massachusettser wollten sie sein, sondern Bürger der großen, über einen ganzen Welttheil sich erstreckenden Republik, Amerikaner. Der Bundes-Republik der Vereinigten Staaten haben sie den Bürgereid geleistet, nicht dem Staate, in welchem sie, meistens durch sehr zufällige Umstände veranlaßt, ihren Wohnsitz aufgeschlagen haben. Es verbinden sich für den deutschen Amerikaner keine theuere Kindheits-Ueberlieferungen mit den Namen der einzelnen zum großen Freistaatenbunde gehörenden Staaten. Die Sondergeschichte dieser Staaten hat für ihn keinen Sinn und Werth; — Sonderpatriotismus, wie der in den deutschen Kleinstaaten herrschende, erscheint bei dem deutschen Amerikaner als eine lächerliche Nachäfferei und macht niemals den Eindruck der Aufrichtigkeit. Selbst da, wo eigenthümliche Verhältnisse den deutschen Amerikanern die Aufgabe zugewiesen haben, als bestimmendes Element für die Zustände eines einzelnen Staates aufzutreten, wie in Missouri, macht sich ihr Einfluß zunächst und vor allen Dingen in der Steigerung des nationalen Bewußtseins geltend. — Bei dem geborenen Amerikaner kann sich die Abtrünnigkeit vom nationalen Wesen, wenn nicht rechtfertigen, wenigstens erklären lassen. Für ihn mag der besondere Staat, in dem er geboren ist, eine so große Summe von Herzensbeziehungen, Neigungen und Wünschen umfassen, daß dadurch das Gefühl der Zusammengehörigkeit mit einer großen Nationalgesammtheit verwischt wird. Der geborene Amerikaner, besonders derjenige, der dem regen Getriebe des Erwerbslebens in den dichter bevölkerten freien Staaten fern geblieben ist, kann und mag den Begriff eines „engeren Vaterlandes" kennen, wie in Deutschland der Preuße, Baier, Schwabe oder Oestreicher und wenn er ihm die Interessen, die Ehre und Größe der Nationalgesammtheit unterordnet, so ist das sehr beklagenswerth, aber es ist wenigstens begreiflich. Aber der deutsche Amerikaner hat hier kein „engeres Vaterland" gesucht, sondern ein großes, einiges und freies Vaterland. Nur ein solches könnte er verstehen, nur einem solchen hat er sich durch einen freiwillig geleisteten Treue-Eid verbunden. Der geborene Amerikaner ist nie darum gefragt worden, ob er Bürger der Ver. Staaten sein wolle; der deutsche Amerikaner hat sie aus freien Stücken zu seiner Heimath erwählt, und ihn knüpfen daran starke Bande der Pflicht, als den Eingeborenen.

Seit zwei Jahren befindet sich die Republik im Kampfe mit einer Auf-

rührerpartei, welche die dauernde Zertrümmerung der großen Nation erstrebt, zu deren Angehörigen die deutschen Amerikaner durch ihren Bürgereid geworden sind. Wenn ein Deutscher so pflichtvergessen sein wollte, um sich nicht durch den Treue-Eid, den er dem Bunde geschworen hat, binden zu lassen, — kann er, seines zerrissenen Heimathlandes eingedenk, ohne den tiefsten Abscheu dem Bemühen der Zerstörung einer Nationaleinheit zuschauen, deren hoher, unschätzbarer Werth ihm durch die Anschauung des Gegensatzes zwischen seinem alten und seinem neuen Vaterlande so klar geworden ist? Muß er, der es an sich selbst erfahren hat, wie zerstörend die nationale Uneinigkeit und Ohnmacht auf die persönlichsten Interessen aller Einzelnen wirkt, nicht jeden, selbst den höchsten Preis für die Bewahrung und Erhaltung der Nationaleinheit gering achten? Welche Zustände würde ein kleinmüthiges Eingehen auf das Begehren der Aufrührer erzeugen! In eine Trennung willigend, würden die freien Staaten der Union zu einem langen schmalen Landstreifen, einem zweiten Canada, einer Macht dritten Ranges herabsinken. Ihr Ansehen, ihre Ehre und Macht wären für immer dahin. Und das wäre nicht Alles. Von einem Uebermüthigen, feindlich gesinnten, durch eine ehrgeizige Aristokratie beherrschten Nachbarvolke nur durch mathematische Linien getrennt, würden sie zu ihrem Schutz eine große stehende Armee und an der Grenze eine lange Mauthlinie zu erhalten haben. Da es an Umtrieben und Ruhestörungen, veranlaßt durch den Süden, niemals fehlen würde, würde die Polizei in ähnlicher Weise wie in Deutschland ein politisches Institut werden. Bald genug würde sich eine „starke Regierung" als eine durch fortwährenden Kriegszustand gebotene Nothwendigkeit herausstellen. Die rasch anwachsende Bevölkerung, auf ein schmales und enges Gebiet zusammengepfercht, würde sich in kurzer Zeit in den diesseits des Mississippi gelegenen Staaten so verdichten, daß das Erwerbsleben, welches jetzt Allen einen schrankenlosen Spielraum zur Bethätigung ihrer Fähigkeiten, ohne Beeinträchtigung Anderer bietet, den Charakter eines bittern, gehässigen Ringens um Brod annehmen würde. Es könnte nicht fehlen, daß sich daraus Beschränkungen der Freizügigkeit, des Niederlassungsrechts und des freien Gewerbebetriebs ergäben. So würde mit der Größe und Macht auch die Freiheit des Landes zu Grunde gehen. Und wer will voraussagen, wie weit die Zerstückelung der Republik, einmal begonnen, sich erstrecken würde? Unter der Voraussetzung, daß die ganze Union wiederhergestellt wird, halten die Staaten und Gebiete am stillen Meere und die im Osten zusammen. Wäre aber einmal jene Voraussetzung zerstört, so würde unzweifelhaft ein Zerfall der Staatengruppen eintreten, die besondere wirthschaftliche und geographische Gebiete bilden. Californien, Oregon und Newada würden eine pacifische Republik, die nordwestlichen Staaten eine mehr zum Süden als zum Osten haltende Mississippi-Republik bilden,

New-York, Pennsylvanien und New-Jersey sich von den Neu-Englandstaaten trennen. Dann wäre aus der stolzen Republik ein zweites Deutschland geworden, ein Haufe ohnmächtiger, sich unablässig bekämpfender und ihre Kräfte untereinander aufreibender Kleinstaaten, ohne Zukunft, ohne Werth für die Darstellung der Völkerfreiheit.

Wahrlich, nicht ein solches Land haben die Deutschen in Amerika gesucht. Was hat Millionen von Deutschen bestimmt, die glänzenden Anerbieten, welche Einwanderern nach Ungarn, Rußland oder Algier geboten werden, zu mißachten und sich in dem fernen Amerika, oft unter schweren Mühen, Leiden und Sorgen, eine Heimath zu gründen? Es war nicht blos ein großes, einiges und mächtiges, sondern zugleich ein freies Land, das sie suchten, — ein Land ohne stehende Heere, ohne drückende Beschränkungen der Gewerbefreiheit, ohne Polizeiherrschaft. Das einige Amerika konnte ihnen bieten, was sie suchten, das zerrissene und zerstückte Amerika würde ihnen nur ein klägliches Seitenstück zu den Zuständen bieten, die sie bei ihrer Auswanderung aus Deutschland für immer hinter sich zu lassen glaubten.

Leicht unterschätzt der Mensch den Werth Dessen, was er hat; erst die Entbehrung lehrt ihn diesen Werth erkennen. Man blicke auf die Deutschen im Süden. Sie, die sich in nächster Nähe der Aufrührerpartei finden und den wahren Charakter derselben kennen, sie sind nicht darüber in Zweifel, Wem sie Sieg zu wünschen haben. Es sind unter ihnen vor dem Ausbruche des Krieges nur sehr wenige Mitglieder der Partei gewesen, durch welche Lincoln gewählt worden ist. Nur den einen Staat Missouri ausgenommen, waren die Deutschen im Süden fast ohne Ausnahme Mitglieder derjenigen politischen Partei, welche die Losreißung vom Bunde ins Werk gesetzt hat. Aber von dem Augenblicke an, wo diese Losreißung erfolgte, sagte ihnen ein richtiger Instinkt, daß ihre Interessen und ihr Wohlergehen mit dem Bestande der Union eng verknüpft seien. Die selbstsüchtigen Schacherer und Krämer unter den Deutschen, die aus Knechtssinn gegen die herrschende Gewalt Begeisterung für einen unabhängigen Süden erheuchelten, bilden eine kleine Minderzahl, zu gering, um auch nur ihren Gewalthabern die Meinung beizubringen, daß sie sich auf die Deutschen verlassen könnten. Ist es nicht im höchsten Grade bezeichnend, daß aus den Hunderttausenden von Deutschen im Süden auch nicht ein einziges deutsches Regiment für die Rebellen hat gebildet werden können? Während im freien Norden die Deutschen aus ihrer Mitte allein schon ein großes Heer mit deutschen Führern gebildet haben, verschwinden in den Armeen des Südens die Deutschen, die Noth oder Gewalt gezwungen hat, den Rebellen zu dienen, vollständig. In dem einzigen Sklavenstaate aber, wo die Deutschen stark genug sind, um sich als ein besonderes Element der Bevölkerung geltend zu machen, in Missouri, — wo stehen sie

vor? Alle, ob Demokraten oder Republikaner, auf Seiten der Nation und der Freiheit gegen die Rebellion und die Knechtschaft. Deutscher Opfermuth und deutscher Heldensinn ist es, der Missouri gerettet hat; deutsche Männer von ächter Art haben auf den Schlachtfeldern von Booneville, von Mill Springs, von Fredericktown und Pea Ridge ihr Leben eingesetzt, um sich oder ihren Kindern die Güter zu bewahren, welche sie in dem freien und einigen Amerika gesucht hatten. — Und wie die Deutschen Missouris auf dem Schlachtfelde, so haben die in Texas als Märtyrer eines namenlos entsetzlichen Militärdespotismus ihr Blut vergossen. Grauenhaft sind die Leiden und Verfolgungen, welchen die dortigen Deutschen ausgesetzt worden sind. Zu Hunderten sind sie niedergemetzelt, oder all ihrer Habe beraubt und als obdachlose Flüchtlinge nach Mexiko gejagt worden. Nicht, weil sie den Rebellen Widerstand geleistet hätten, — dazu waren sie viel zu schwach, sondern nur, weil sie Deutsche, weil sie fleißig und betriebsam waren und durch die That den Beweis lieferten, daß ein fleißiger Mensch auch im Süden gedeihen könne, ohne sich von leibeigenen Knechten bedienen zu lassen. Das allein schon machte sie den Rebellen verhaßt. Ihr Fleiß, ihr durch eigene, freie Arbeit erworbener Wohlstand war ihr Verbrechen. Die Rebellen wußten, daß ein betriebsamer freier Arbeiter niemals von Herzen einer Adelsrepublik anhängen kann, daß er, selbst unbewußt, immer nach ähnlichen bürgerlichen Zuständen, wie die im Norden der Union herrschenden, streben wird. Und darum suchten sie die Deutschen zu vernichten, auszurotten, oder, wenn das ihrer Menge wegen unmöglich wäre, ihren Wohlstand zu stören und sie zur Flucht aus dem Lande zu zwingen.

Diese Leiden, welche Tausende unserer Stammesgenossen um keiner andern Sünde willen, als der, Deutsche zu sein, im Süden zu erdulden gehabt und noch haben, — sie enthalten die ernsteste Mahnung an die Deutschen im Norden, alle ihre Kräfte freudig der Unterdrückung einer Rebellion zu widmen, die, wenn siegreich, das ganze deutsche Element mit eiserner Hand erdrücken würde. Kann es Deutsche geben, die so einsichtsvoll oder so pflichtvergessen sind, um zu sagen, daß die Nation sich vor den Rebellen demüthigen und ihnen die Hunderttausende, wenn nicht Millionen aufrichtiger Unionsmänner im Süden auf Gnade und Ungnade überantworten soll? — Denn nichts Geringeres, als das, würde ein Friede mit dem Süden bedeuten. Aufs feierlichste haben die Führer aller Parteien im Süden erklärt, daß sie einen Frieden, der auf eine Wiederherstellung der Union abzielte, um keinen Preis annehmen würden, daß sie mit den „Yankees" nicht wieder zusammenleben wollen, selbst wenn diese sich zu ihren leibeigenen Sklaven machen wollten, daß Nichts sie zufrieden stellen kann, als Trennung und daß sie die „Friedensdemokraten" im Norden mit ihrer Einbildung, durch Frieden und Compromisse die Bundeseinheit wiederherstellen zu können, aufs

gründlichste verachten. Ein Friede, jeder Friede, der einer gänzlichen Zertrümmerung der Militärmacht des Südens voranginge, bedeutet also nichts Geringeres, als dauernde Zertrümmerung des Landes, die Vernichtung jeder großen Zukunft der Republik und die schmachvolle Preisgebung zahlloser Unionisten im Süden, besonders der Deutschen, an die Rache und den Haß einer halbbarbarischen, grausamen und blutgierigen Bevölkerung.

Ach, und gleichwohl giebt es deutschredende Bürger des Landes, — nicht im Süden, sondern hier im Norden, die theils aus engherzigem Parteihaß, theils aus Unkenntniß der Entstehungsursachen und des Zweckes der Rebellion mit ihr sympathisiren, die Sache der Nation beschädigen und verkleinern, wo sie können, und die Nothwehrmaßregeln, zu welchen ein um seine höchsten Güter ringendes Volk durch die drohende Gefahr gezwungen worden ist, als nachträgliche Rechtfertigung der Rebellion betrachten. Es giebt Deutsche, die, weil sie früher stets gewohnt waren, in den Rebellenhäuptlingen die Leiter ihrer, der demokratischen Partei zu sehen, auch jetzt zu denselben halten zu müssen glauben, die in dem widerwärtigen Rothwelsch ihrer Partei den Krieg, den nicht eine Regierung, sondern ein großes freies Volk führt, als einen „schwarzrepublikanischen„ oder „abolitionistischen" bezeichnen und dadurch zu beschimpfen glauben. Daß fast zwei Jahre lang das Volk sich vergebens abgemüht und gerungen hat, um eine Wiederherstellung der Union mit sammt der Sklaverei zu erlangen, ehe es, die vollkommene Unmöglichkeit eines solchen Unternehmens erkennend, sich entschlossen hat, die Sklaverei fahren zu lassen, — das gilt diesen Freunden der Rebellen als Beweis dafür, daß der Krieg von Anfang an zum Zweck einer Zerstörung einer Sklaverei geführt worden sei. Und in dieser Behauptung finden sie dann zugleich eine Rechtfertigung des Südens dafür, daß er den Krieg angefangen hat. Der Süden, sagen sie, wußte, daß die Republikaner, einmal an's Ruder gelangt, die Sklaverei zu zerstören suchen würden. Darum glaubte er ihnen zuvorkommen und sich gegen das ihm drohende Unheil dadurch schützen zu müssen, daß er sich noch vor Lincoln's Amtsantritt bewehrte, sich der Bundesforts im Süden bemächtigte, eine Armee bildete, kurz, den Krieg eröffnete.

Nur blinde Parteiwuth, die sich jedem Einflusse vernünftiger Gründe entzieht, oder die vollständigste Unkenntniß der politischen Geschichte der Ver. Staaten kann solchen Behauptungen der mit den Landesfeinden gleichgesinnten Volksverführer Gehör und Eingang verschaffen. Wer nur die geringste Kenntniß von der Entwickelung des amerikanischen Parteilebens hat, weiß, daß niemals ein Krieg auf schnödere, böswilligere Weise und ohne die mindeste berechtigte Veranlassung herbeigeführt worden ist, als der jetzige durch den Sklavenhalter-Adel des Südens. Er weiß, daß die

Losreißung des Südens von den Sklavenhaltern schon seit länger als einem Menschenalter geplant worden ist, denn die Hauptredner der Sezessionisten in dem südcarolinischen Staatsconvente, welcher die Losreißung beschloß, haben das mit dürren, klaren Worten erklärt. Er weiß, daß die Minister Buchanans, Thompson, Floyd und Toucey, bereits alle Vorbereitungen für den Krieg des Südens gegen den Norden getroffen hatten, ehe die als Vorwand zur Empörung benutzte Erwählung Lincolns stattfand. Er weiß vor allen Dingen, daß die Sklavenhalter absichtlich, durch Zerspaltung der demokratischen Partei in der Nationalconvention von 1860, die Erwählung Lincolns möglich gemacht und bewirkt haben, weil sie zum Losschlagen bereit und entschlossen waren, aber eines äußeren Vorwandes bedurften, um die Masse der nichtsklavenhaltenden Bevölkerung des Südens zur blinden Wuth zu entflammen.

Nicht ein armseliges Parteiprogramm, nicht die Frage über Auslieferung oder Nichtauslieferung eines flüchtigen Sklaven, oder selbst über die Einführung der Sklaverei in einem der Bundesterritorien, hat das Attentat der Sklavenhalter gegen die Nationaleinheit hervorgerufen. Es ist der unauslöschliche Haß und die Verachtung, welche der bevorrechtete Adel gegen das „gemeine Volk", der menschenbesitzende Aristokrat gegen den Bürger und Arbeiter empfindet, die in diesem Attentate zu einem so furchtbaren Ausdrucke gelangt sind. Lange schon, ehe es nur dem Namen nach eine republikanische Partei gab, hatte diese Verachtung sich in dem ganzen Auftreten der Repräsentanten des Südens im Bundescongresse kundgegeben. Länger als ein Jahrzehnt ist es her, seit ein übermüthiger Sklavenhalter im Congresse den Vertretern des Nordens zurief: „Wir, die Pflanzer des Südens, beherrschen euch Nordländer mit Hülfe unserer weißen Sklaverei, der Demokraten". In demselben Sinne schrieb der Louisville „Courier" vor anderthalb Jahren die folgenden Worte, die nur zu klar den Sinn und die Bedeutung der Rebellion des Südens ausdrücken:

„Wir, die Südländer, sind nicht stammverwandte Brüder der Yankees und die Sklavereifrage ist nur der Vorwand, nicht die wirkliche Ursache des Krieges. Der südliche Edelmann kann und mag nicht die pöbelhafte Familiarität des Nordländers ertragen. So lange, als wir die demokratischen Canaillen und Memmen im Norden kaufen, oder einschüchtern konnten, so lange konnte sich der Süden die Union gefallen lassen. Wie unsere normanischen Ahnen in England, obschon immer eine Minorität, die Angelsachsen bis auf den heutigen Tag in politischer Knechtschaft erhalten haben, so haben wir, die Sklavenbarone, bis vor einem Jahre die Nordländer beherrscht. Wir haben die Verfassung gemacht; wir haben siebzig Jahre die Politik des Landes bestimmt und Männer aus unsrer eigenen Mitte, oder sogenannte nördliche Männer mit südlichen

Grundsätzen mit der Verwaltung des Landes betraut. Am 6. November 1860 warfen unsere Knechte im Norden unsere Herrschaft ab und befinden sich jetzt im Aufruhr gegen ihre früheren Eigenthümer." „Für uns" schrieb vor kaum einem Jahre der Richmond Whig, „ist der Krieg ein Kampf um ererbte Rechte, um das Heiligthum von Haus und Heerd, um den alten Ruhm edleren Blutes. Es ist der alte, nie endende Kampf zwischen dem Patrizier und der Plebs, zwischen dem Adel und dem Pöbel."

Wahr ist, was hier im frechen Uebermuth dem „Pöbel" in's Gesicht geschleudert wird, daß der südliche Pflanzeradel siebzig Jahre lang die Union beherrscht, ihre Gesetze gegeben, ihre ganze Macht zur Förderung der Interessen des Südens, oder vielmehr der Aristokratie im Süden geltend gemacht hat. Denn „wenn der Pflanzer das Wort Süden gebraucht," schreibt der Demokrat Tharin aus Alabama, der ein Unionsmann, doch zugleich ein bitterer Gegner der Lincoln'schen Regierung ist, „so versteht er darunter niemals die nichtsklavenhaltenden Weißen mit, obschon deren Zahl sich zur Zahl der Sklavenhalter wie 15 zu 1 verhält. So vollständig und unbedingt ist die Herrschaft, welche der sklavenbesitzende Adel im Süden über die Masse des Volks ausübt, daß unter den Worten Süden, Rechte des Südens und Interessen des Südens niemals etwas anderes verstanden wird, als die Pflanzer, ihre Vorrechte und ihre Interessen."

Und eben dieser Süden, d. h. die Aristokratenklasse im Süden, hat Menschenalter hindurch die Union beherrscht. Als die lose Eidgenossenschaft, welche die nordamerikanischen Freistaaten nach ihrer Losreißung von England gebildet hatten, in einen Bundesstaat umgewandelt wurden, setzten es die Pflanzer der Südstaaten durch, daß ihnen die Einfuhr von Negersklaven aus Afrika bis 1808 gestattet wurde, und daß sie im Bundescongresse eine stärkere Vertretung als die freien Staaten erhielten. Es wurden bei der Vertheilung der Repräsentationsbezirke nach der Kopfzahl den Sklavenstaaten drei Fünftel der Zahl ihrer Sklaven gutgerechnet, obschon sie selbst diese Sklaven so wenig, wie ihre Pferde oder Rinder als Einwohner, sondern lediglich als Eigenthum betrachteten. Louisiana und Florida wurden mit dem Gelde der Nation gekauft, um die politische Macht der Sklavenhalter zu stärken. Missouri ward, obschon durch seine Lage, sein Klima und seine Bodenbeschaffenheit ganz auf freie Arbeit angewiesen, als Sklavenstaat in die Union gezwängt. Als eine Art Entschädigung dafür boten die Sklavenhalter die feierliche Zusage, daß sie in allem westlich von Missouri gelegenen Gebiet auf die Einführung der Sklaverei verzichten wollten. Aber als dreißig Jahre später die nach Westen fortschreitende Cultur sich jenem Gebiete zu nähern begann, ward die feierliche Zusage schnöde gebrochen und mit Hülfe ihrer „nördlichen Knechte" versuchten es die Sklaven-

halter, gewaltsam, mit Feuer und Schwert die Sklaverei in Kansas einzuführen.

Texas ward mit dem Blute und Gelde der Nation erobert, um, wie es südliche Staatsmänner ohne Umschweife erklärten, als festes Bollwerk für die Sklaverei und zugleich als Ausgangspunkt für weitere Eroberungen zu dienen. Dagegen ward in einem Grenzstreite mit England ohne weiteres ein Landgebiet aufgegeben, groß genug, um im Laufe der Zeit ein halbes Dutzend Staaten daraus zu bilden, — denn diese Staaten würden der Lage wegen, freie geworden sein und eine Vermehrung der freien Staaten kam den Sklavenhaltern nicht in den Sinn. In der auswärtigen Politik anmaßend, brutal gegen schwache Nationen, vor stärkern gern die Segel einziehend, waren die Sklavenhalter im eigenen Lande eifrig bemüht, alle von der Bundesverfassung gewährleisteten Grundrechte zu zerstören. In den Sklavenstaaten herrschte ein so vollständiger Despotismus und bestand eine so totale Unmündigkeit der nicht zum Pflanzeradel gehörenden Volksklassen, wie nur jemals in der Adelsrepublik Polen. Der Mensch fing erst beim Baron an. Was drunter war, hatte keine andere Rechte, als bei Wahlen für die ihnen von den Pflanzern vorgeschriebenen Candidaten Stimmzettel abzugeben und gelegentlich — Abolitionisten zu ermorden, oder zu mißhandeln. Eine wirkliche Freiheit der Rede und Presse existirte so wenig, wie in Rußland. Wer sich nur unterfing, in Zweifel zu ziehen, daß die Sklaverei eine nützliche und einträgliche Einrichtung sei, wurde sofort als ein Verräther der Lynchjustiz überantwortet. Ein Wort, ein Wink, ein Stirnerunzeln des Pflanzers reichte hin, um einen beliebigen Fremden, der eine alte nördliche Zeitung bei sich führte, oder vielleicht auch nur sich unterstanden hatte, einen verschwenderischen Pflanzer um eine alte Schuld zu mahnen, der thierischen Wuth eines rohen Pöbels zu überliefern. Denn, wie in allen Ländern, in welchen eine bevorrechtete Minderheit herrschte, so war auch im Süden die große Masse des Volkes in abschreckendster Unwissenheit und Rohheit erhalten. Dort giebt es nicht, wie in den freien Staaten des Nordens, auch in den kleinsten Dörfern, Volksschulen, in welchen die Kinder, selbst des ärmsten Mannes, sich die Elemente einer menschenwürdigen Bildung erwerben können. Die Vertheilung des Grundbesitzes in große Plantagen verhindert die Bildung halbwegs dichter Ansiedelungen, verzettelt die Bevölkerung auf weite Entfernungen hin, und macht es schon dadurch schwer, Schulen zu erhalten. Dazu kommt, daß die reichen Pflanzer, aller Volksbildung abhold, weil sie in ihr den Erbfeind der Unfreiheit und der Bevorrechtung erkennen, nicht allein nichts thun, um das Entstehen von Schulen zu befördern, sondern es auf jede Weise verhindern. Die Folge ist, daß in den südlichen Staaten hunderttausende von ärmeren Weißen in der tiefsten Unwissenheit und Rohheit aufwachsen,

nicht einmal lesen lernen, von den Beziehungen, in welchen sie zum Staate und zur Außenwelt stehen, weniger erfahren, als Chinesen oder Hottentotten, und so nothwendig zu blinden Knechten der reichen Pflanzer werden, deren lügnerische Darstellungen Alles sind, was sie jemals über ihre Rechte oder Pflichten erfahren. Nach der Volkszählung von 1850 besuchten im Staate Massachusetts 200,000 Kinder die Schulen, und der Staat wendete an ihre Erziehung $,1,300,000. In dem an Einwohnerzahl ungefähr ebenso großen Staate Südcarolina betrug die Gesammtzahl der Schüler 17,000, also kaum ein Zwölftel so viel, wie in dem freien Staate Massachusetts und der Staat verwendete auf die Schulen nicht mehr als $75,000, — d. h. nur den achtzehnten Theil der vom Staate Massachussetts für die Volksbildung verwendeten Summe. In dem einzigen Staate New-York besuchten mehr Kinder die Schulen, als in allen 15 Sklavenstaaten zasammengenommen. Volksbildung und Freiheit, — Volksunbildung und Unfreiheit stehen stets und überall in Wechselwirkung mit einander. Die Presse, selbst wenn sie dem Namen nach frei, hört auf, es in Wirklichkeit zu sein, wenn sie für die Masse des Volkes, die unfähig ist, zu lesen, nicht existirt und alle ihre Eingebungen von einer bevorrechteten Klasse erhält.

Wehe dem, der im Süden unter der Herrschaft der Sklavenhalter nur ein freies Wort — nicht blos über die Negersklaverei, nein, nur über die gedrückte Lage der armen Weißen, oder die Nothwendigkeit einer bessern Volkserziehung zu schreiben wagte. Für das Verbrechen, die Herausgabe einer Zeitung in Alabama beabsichtigt zu haben, welche die Interessen der nichtsklavenbesitzenden armen weißen Bauern und Arbeiten vertreten sollte, ward Tharin mit 30 Knutenhieben bestraft und bei Androhung der Todesstrafe aus dem Lande gejagt.

Lange Zeit hindurch hatte der Adel des Südens, nicht ohne Erfolg, versucht, auch über die freien Staaten seine Herrschaft in demselben Sinne zu üben. Die öffentliche Meinung ward durch seine Werkzeuge auf eine Weise verderbt, daß sie die einfachsten Begriffe des Naturrechts und der Menschlichkeit zu ruchlosen Ketzereien stempelte. Wer sich zu den unsterblichen Lehren der Stifter der Republick, eines Washington, Jefferson, Franklin und Payne bekannte und darauf drang, daß allen Menschen gleiche Rechte auf Leben, Freiheit und Arbeit gesichert würden, ward als ein Staatsverbrecher behandelt. Für ihn gab es keine Preßfreiheit, außer mit dem Galgen daneben, keine Redefreiheit, außer unter dem Mordstahl erkaufter Knechte der Sklavenhalter. Noch kein Menschenalter ist es her, daß in dem freien Illinois Lovejoy von dem im Dienste der Pflanzer stehenden Pöbel ermordet ward, weil er über die Sklaverei in gleichem Sinne, wie Washington zu reden gewagt hatte, und noch kein Jahrzehnt, seit in der Stadt New York wilde Rotten unter dem Commando eines hervorra-

genden Leiters der Sklavenhalterpartei eine friedliche Versammlung von Gegnern der Sklaverei mit Keulenschlägen und Steinwürfen sprengten. Die natürliche Bedeutung der einfachsten Begriffe wurde in ihr Gegentheil verkehrt. Die Erhaltung der entsetzlichsten Vorrechte und mittelalterlicher Barbarei ward mit dem Namen „Demokratie" bezeichnet. Für Verbrechen galt nicht allein jeder Zweifel daran, daß die Sklaverei eine segensreiche, christlich-humane Einrichtung sei, sondern selbst der schwächste Versuch, zu beweisen, daß sie uneinträglich sei, daß sie zur Verarmung der Staaten führe, in welchen sie bestehe, und daß es also nicht wünschenswerth sei, sie nach solchen Gebieten hin auszubreiten, wo sie vorher nicht bestanden habe.

Auf solche Weise hatte der Pflanzeradel des Südens das Land regiert: — mit Hülfe seiner „weißen Leibeigenen" (der demokratischen Partei) im Norden, wie er selbst hohnlachend prahlte. Und warum plante er dennoch die Zertrümmerung der Republik?

Weil er einsah, daß auf die Dauer alle seine Bemühungen, den Geist eines freien Volkes in Ketten zu schlagen, kläglich mißlingen würden. Weil trotz der Aechtung aller offen auf den Sturz der Adelherrschaft abzielenden Bestrebungen, die immer schneller steigende Entwickelung dee Macht und des Wohlstandes der freien Staaten ein Selbstgefühl und ein Bewußtsein der Kraft erzeugte, welche den dauernden Fortbestand der Herrschaft des Pflanzeradels unmöglich machten. An Einwohnerzahl und Wohlstand blieb der Süden weit hinter den rasch und kraftvoll aufblühenden freien Staaten zurück; — nur dadurch, daß er eine große Partei im Norden sich und seinen Interessen dienstbar machte, hatte der südliche Adel in der Bundescentralgewalt seine Ohnmacht erhalten. Aber von Jahrzehnt zu Jahrzehnt ward das schwieriger. Immer neue freie Staaten wuchsen empor und jeder von ihnen sandte seine Vertreter zum Bundescongresse; eine immer größere Zahl unter diesen Vertretern gewann den Muth, sich den Anmaßungen der Sklavenhalter zu widersetzen. Zwar für die ihnen wirklich durch den Bund gewährleisteten Rechte hatten sie nichts zu fürchten. Keine Partei im Norden dachte nur im Entferntesten daran, den Rechten, welche die Sklavenhalter in ihren eigenen Staaten hatten, zu nahe zu treten. Aber was sie zu fürchten Grund hatten, war, daß eine nicht mehr von ihnen beherrschte Bundesgewalt von ihnen eine strenge Innehaltung ihrer Pflichten fordern, die von der Bundesverfassung gewährleistete Rede- und Preßfreiheit auch im Süden zu einer Wahrheit zu machen suchen würde. Dieser Gefahr wollten sie sich nicht aussetzen. Sie wußten, daß die Fortdauer ihrer Herrschaft unmöglich sein würde, wenn man die ärmern Klassen der weißen Bevölkerung des Südens zum Genuß derselben Rechte zuließe, welche dieselben Klassen im Norden genießen. Sie wollten lieber in einem kleineren Bun-

desstaate allmächtig sein, als in einer großen Republik sich an allgemeiner Rechtsgleichheit genügen lassen. Darum entschlossen sie sich, die Union zu zertrümmern in der Hoffnung, auf ihren Ruinen ein mächtiges Adelsreich, vielleicht eine dereinstige Monarchie zu erbauen. Denn mehr als einmal schon ist von den Wortführern der Sklavenhalter die monarchische Staatsverfassung als das letzte zu erstrebende Endspiel bezeichnet worden.

In welcher Weise und mit welchen Mitteln die Zertrümmerung der Republik versucht ward, ist in Aller Gedächtniß. Der ruchloseste Treubruch, Meineid und Unterschleif mußte den Sklavenhaltrn die Mittel zur Ausführung ihres Vorhabens liefern. Einschüchterung und offene Gewaltthat mußten da, wo eine Berufnng an die Unwissenheit und die rohen Leidenschaften der Massen nicht ausreichten, eine wirkliche oder scheinbare Einmüthigkeit der ganzen Bevölkerung des Südens erzeugen. Das Volk der freien Staaten, seinerseits so von Nationalgefühl durchdrungen, daß es nicht an den Etnst der Losreißungsbestrebungen glauben mochte uud darin lediglich Drohungen zur Erpressung von Zugeständnissen erblickte, sah in starrem Staunen, wie gelähmt und unfähig, nur eine Hand zur Abwendung des drohenden Unheils zu erheben, den Vorgängen in den südlichen Staaten zu. Es glaubte monatelang, daß es nur in einem bösen, schrecklichen Traume befangen sei; wartete jeden Tag darauf, daß der Süden die zum Schlage erhobene Hand zurückziehen und lachend erklären werde, nur einen groben Spaß getrieben zu haben. Die Diener der Sklavenhalter bestärkten es in diesem Wahne und riefen die heftigsten Verwünschungen auf Alle herab, die sich unterstehen würden, den Drohungen und Gewaltthaten des Südens zu begegnen. „Keinen Zwang, keine Vergewaltigung!" war ihre Losung; „man gebe dem Süden Alles, was er will, und die Ruhe wird wiederhergestellt sein." Und das ward gesagt, während die Führer des Aufruhrs im offenen Bundessenate erklärten: „Selbst wenn ihr uns ein weißes Blatt Papier gäbet, um ganz nach unsrem Belieben die Bedingungen niederzuschreiben, unter welchen wir wieder dem Bunde angehören wollen, würden wir es euch ins Gesicht werfen." Der Präsident Lincoln trat sein Amt an, rathlos, unentschlossen, so wenig, wie die große Masse des Volks die Gefahr der Lage und den Ernst der Absichten des Südens klar erkennend. Durch feierliche Zusicherung der strengsten Wahrung aller den Sklavenhaltern verbürgten Rechte und durch Verzicht auf jeden Versuch, die Bundesautorität da, wo sie bereits zerstört war, mit Gewalt herzustellen, glaubte er auch den Sturm beschwichtigen, den unheilbaren Conflikt zwischen einem herrschsüchtigen Adel und einem freien Volke beschwören zu können.

Vergebens! Der Donner der Geschütze, welche der Landesverrath auf

die Mauern des Fort Sumter gerichtet hatte, verscheuchte alle freundlichen Täuschungen über die Möglichkeit einer Versöhnung und zwang dem Volke die Ueberzeugung auf, daß ihm keine Wahl bleibe, als die Einheit und Größe des Landes von Frevlerhänden vernichtet zu sehen, oder einen Kampf auf Tod und Leben gegen die Missethäter zu beginnen, die den Mordstahl zum Stoße in das Herz der Republik gezückt hatten.

Seit zwei Jahren wüthet jetzt dieser Kampf. Noch ist er nicht entschieden. Ungeheure Anstrengungen und Opfer, die ein freies Volk dargebracht hat, sind durch Kurzsichtigkeit, Charakterschwäche oder Unfähigkeit der Führer, die es sich gegeben hat, vereitelt worden. Hunderttausende seiner Söhne haben auf Schlachtfeldern oder in Lagern und Schanzgräben ihr Leben oder ihre Gesundheit hingegeben, und die Summen, welche das Volk aus seinem Erwerb freiwillig der Regierung dargebracht hat, übersteigen 1000 Millionen Dollars. Kaum jemals, seit es Völker giebt, hat ein freies Volk aus eigenem Willen so verschwenderisch Gut und Blut für seine höchsten Lebensgüter geopfert. Und noch immer kann es dieser Opfer kein Ende absehen. Wohl ist ein großer Theil des Gebietes der Rebellion unterworfen worden, und in dieser Beziehung der Krieg bis jetzt schon *erfolgreicher* gewesen, als irgend ein europäischer Krieg der Neuzeit, denn das dem Bunde wieder unterworfene Gebiet mißt Hunderttausende von Quadratmeilen. Aber zur Bewältigung der ganzen Rebellion bleibt noch viel, sehr viel zu thun.

Soll man deswegen den Muth verlieren und in kleinmüthiger Verzagtheit den Einflüsterungen Derer Gehör geben, welche einen faulen Frieden, der die Keime nie endender künftiger Kriege in sich tragen würde, um den Preis der Schande, der Demüthigung, ja des nationalen Unterganges der Republik erkaufen möchten? Soll man zugeben, daß der nordamerikanische Continent, den ein gütiges Geschick zum Schauplatze einer großen auf allgemeiner Volksfreiheit beruhenden Gesittungsperiode der Menschheit bestimmt zu haben schien, wie Europa in ein Gewirr von Staaten zerbröckelt werde, die im unablässigen Hader untereinander ihre besten Lebenskräfte schnöde vergeuden, und in welchen auf den Trümmern der Volksfreiheit der Despotismus sich neue Zwingburgen erbaut?

Dem *deutschen* Amerikaner wenigstens bleibe so schimpfliches Verzagen ferne! Er entstammt einem Volke, das Menschenalter hindurch gerungen hat, um die Ideen, für welche der freie Norden kämpft, gegenüber dem vom Sklavenhalter vertretenen Prinzipe mittelalterlicher Unfreiheit und Bevorrechtung zur Geltung zu bringen. Denn der Kampf, in welchem Amerika sich befindet, ist in seinem Wesen derselbe, den Europa, den Deutschland in Folge der Reformation zu bestehen gehabt hat. Dort war es der Conflikt zwischen der Freiheit des Einzelnen und der starren Autorität auf

geistigem Gebiete, welcher Menschenalter hindurch die Länder Europas in Schauplätze blutigen Haders verwandelte; hier ist es der Kampf der bürgerlichen Freiheit gegen den Versuch, die auf Unfreiheit und Rohheit beruhende Staatsform zur herrschenden zu machrn, welcher zwei Hälften einer großen Nation gegen einander bewaffnet.

„Cavaliere" nennen sich die südlichen Pflanzer selbst und blicken mit Verachtung auf den rohen „Arbeiterpöbel" des Nordens herab. Der träge Genuß todten Besitzes, dem die erzwungene Areit geknechteter Menschen den Zins abgewinnt, ist ihnen der Inbegriff aller Wohlanständigkeit; — den durch Arbeit, sei es körperliche oder geistige, erworbenen Besitz verachten sie. Wie die schnödesten deutschen Junker suchen sie ihren höchsten Stolz darin, Alles, was sie sind und haben, ererbt und nicht durch eigene Thätigkeit erworben zu haben. Dem, der durch Fleiß und Geschick sich zu Ansehen und Vermögen emporringt, sprechen sie alles Anrecht auf gesellschaftliche Gleichstellung mit sich so entschieden ab, wie der mecklenburgische Edelmann dem bürgerlichen Gutsbesitzer, Industriellen oder Kaufmann. Den freien Arbeiter schätzen sie wo möglich noch geringer als den leibeigenen Neger; sie bezeichnen ihn als „weißen Sklaven," dessen Lebenszweck sei, den bevorzugten Klassen zu dienen, — etwa wie die Cavaliere des vorigen Jahrhunderts annahmen, daß sie mit Sporen an den Füßen und der „Pöbel" mit Sätteln auf dem Rücken geboren sei, um von ihnen geritten zu werden. Im März 1858 setzte der Bundessenator von Süd-Carolina, Hammond, diese Lehren des Junkerthums mit einer Schärfe und Rücksichtslosigkeit auseinander, wie sie selbst in Deutschland, ja in Rußland unerhört wäre. Denn heutzutage wagt der Adel auch dort nicht mehr, solche Lehren, wie die der Sklavenhalter Ameriea's, offen zu predigen, die freie Arbeit als schimpflichen Frohndienst zu verhöhnen und den Fortschritt auf allen Gebieten des Erwerbslebens, wie der geistigen Bildung als eine Barbarei zu bezeichnen. Doch der amerikanische Pflanzeradel wagt es, wagt es nicht bloß, sondern begeht auch noch die maßlose Frechheit, seinen Lehren den Namen „Demokratie" zu geben. Wie viele Eingewanderte haben sich nicht durch den plumpen Betrug, der in dem Gebrauche dieses Wortes lag, bethören lassen! Wie viele gibt es, die noch heute in völliger Verleugnung alles gesunden Menschenverstandes, die mit den ersten Voraussetzungen aller Volksfreiheit im strengsten Gegensatze stehenden Lehren der Sklavenhalter als „demokratische" bezeichnen! Als ob nicht Achtung vor der Arbeit und dem Selbstwerthe des Menschen, den sie darstellt, die unterste Grundlage jedes wahrhaft freien Staatswesens wäre!

Man werfe nur einen Blick auf die öffentlichen Zustände des Südens, wie sie sich unter der nun schon über zwei Jahre währenden unumschränkten, Herrschaft der Sklavenhalter entwickelt haben. Verräthergenossen im Nor-

den schelten über die angeblichen Beschränkungen der persönlichen Freiheit, welche die Bundesregierung eingeführt habe. Sie wissen nichts der Art anzuführen, als die Verhaftung einiger Dutzend ihrer Genossen, welche offen gewaltsamen Aufruhr gepredigt haben. Damit vergleiche man den Süden. Dort besteht für Diejenigen, welche der Rebellion so abholb sind, wie die Rebellenfreunde im Norden der Bekämpfung des Südens, so wenig Rede- und Preßfreiheit, wie für rothe Republikaner in Rußland. Hunderte und aber hunderte loyale Bürger des Südens sind oft bloß auf den Verdacht, verdächtig zu sein, erhängt, erschossen, oder als obdachlo e Flüchtlinge von Haus und Heerd gejagt worden. Ein Militärdespotismus, so unumschränkt und rücksichtslos, wie er je in absoluten Monarchieen bestanden hat, drängt alle Functionen der ordentlichen Behörden bei Seite. Ein Conscriptionsgesetz, welches die Aushebung aller männlichen Einwohner vom 16. bis zum 60. Jahre anordnet, nimmt ausdrücklich die reichen Pflanzer, die mehr als 20 Sklaven besitzen, von der Militärpflicht aus. Die durch den Abschluß von der Außenwelt erzeugte Noth setzt die reichen Sklavenhalter in den Stand, die Güter der weniger Bemittelten um ein Lumpengeld an sich zu bringen, macht die Aristokratie nur immer stolzer und mächtiger, während sie die kleinen Grundbesitzer mehr und mehr auf ein und dieselbe Stufe mit leibeigenen Arbeitern setzt. Verachtung aller Vorschriften der Gesittung erzeugt bei den rebellischen Pflanzern eine Bosheit und Blutgier, die sonst nur den rohesten Zeiten der Barbarei angehört. Daher die vielen Drohungen der Rebellen mit einem Vernichtungskriege, der nur durch Ermordung der gefangenen Bundesoffiziere zum Austrag gebracht werden könne.

Es ist vergeblich, da, wo solche Anschauungen walten, einen andern Ausgang zu denken, als die völlige Vernichtung des einen von beiden Theilen, wie lange oder kurze Zeit auch der Kampf währen möge. Denn selbst wenn man die Möglichkeit eines die Zerreißung der Union sanctionirenden Friedens gelten lassen wollte, — wie könnten zwei Nachbarvölker, in denen so entgegengesetzte Anschauungen, Stimmungen und Leidenschaften bestehen, jemals in Frieden miteinander leben? Ihre Beziehungen zu einander würden die eines unausgesetzten Kriegszustandes sein. Es stehen sich in Nord und Süd die Prinzipien der Freiheit und der aristokratischen Bevorrechtung in gleicher Schroffheit im Kampfe gegenüber, wie jemals in Europa der Protestantismus und der Katholizismus, die Demokratie und der Absolutismus.

Ein solcher Kampf kann nicht durch Versöhnung oder Beschwichtigung beendet, er muß durchgekämpft werden, bis einem der beiden Prinzipien der vollständige Sieg über das andere verbleibt. Was sind zwei Jahre für einen Kampf, bei dem so unermeßlich Wichtiges entschieden werden soll? Sieben Jahre haben die nordamerikanischen Colonieen unter Leiden und Ent-

behrungen, mit welchen die durch den jetzigen Krieg den freien Staaten verursachten keinen Vergleich aushalten, gekämpft und gerungen, ehe sie ihre Unabhängigkeit und England erstritten. Und die heutigen Vereinigten Staaten, mit einer achtmal größeren Bevölkerung und huntertmal größerem Besitzthum sollten schon nach zwei Jahren in dem Kampfe um die Freiheit erlahmen?

Das kann, das wird nicht geschehen. Selbst wenn die Rathschläge des Kleinmuths oder des Verraths Gehör finden sollten, in dem Trotze, womit die Rebellen jeden, selbst den erniedrigendsten Vorschlag zur Wiedervereinigung zurückweisen, liegt die Bürgschaft dafür, daß der Krieg zum Austrag gebracht werden m u ß.

Mögen denn die d e u t s c h e n Amerikaner, eingedenk des Treu-Eides, welchen sie der Republik geschworen, sich des Landes ihrer Geburt, wie des Landes ihrer freien Wahl würdig zeigen. Des Landes ihrer Geburt, in welchem das Streben nach geistiger Freiheit, das den Abschluß des Mittelalters bezeichnet, seinen Ursprung genommen hat; — des Landes ihrer Wahl, in welchem dieses Streben durch die Schöpfung eines auf Freiheit beruhenden Völkerbundes zur kraftvollsten Darstellung gelangt ist. Mögen sie stets eingedenk bleiben der großen Wahrheit, daß Niemand der Freiheit werth ist, der sie nicht allen Menschen gönnt und daß die Vernichtung der Menschenrechte auch der geringsten und niedrigsten Mitglieder der Gesellschaft sich durch Zerstörung der Grundlage des ganzen Gesellschaftsbaus auf's bitterste rächt.

K ine schwächliche Verzagtheit, keine Rücksicht selbstischen Interesses, kein Verdruß über Thorheiten, Mißgriffe und Unzulänglichkeiten, die von weniger begabten Führern begangen werden, darf in Demjenigen, der den Werth der Güter begreift, um welche der Kampf geführt wird, den opferfreudigen Eifer und die von Zuversicht durchdrungene Hingabe an die Sache der Republik verkümmern oder verlöschen. „E i n h e i t u n d F r e i h e i t!" sei das Losungswort jetzt und immerdar! In diesem Zeichen muß und wird den Sieg errungen werden, — ein Sieg nicht bloß für heute und für ein Volk, sondern für die Zukunft der gesammten Menschheit.

Loyal Leagues, Gesellschaften, oder einzelne Personen können unsere Publikationen zum Kostenpreise erhalten, wenn sie sich an das Executiv-Comite, oder persönlich nach dem Gesellschaftslokale, No. 863 Broadway, wenden, wo überhaupt jede Auskunft über die Gesellschaft ertheilt wird.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

863 BROADWAY,

No. 20.

MILITARY DESPOTISM.

ARBITRARY ARREST OF A JUDGE!

At the conclusion of the war with England, on the 3d of March, 1815, while General Jackson was in New Orleans, an article appeared in the *Louisiana Courier*, concluding as follows:

"Let us conclude by saying that it is high time the laws should resume their empire; that the citizens of this State should return to the full enjoyment of their rights; that, in acknowledging that we are indebted to General Jackson for the preservation of our city and the defeat of the British, we do not feel inclined, through gratitude, to sacrifice any of our privileges, and, less than any other, that of expressing our opinion of the acts of his administration; that it is time the citizens accused of any crime should be rendered to their natural judges, and cease to be brought before special or *military tribunals*—a kind of institution held in abhorrence, even in absolute governments; that, after having done enough for glory, the moment of moderation has arrived; and, finally, that the acts of authority which the invasion of our country and our safety may have rendered necessary, are, since the evacuation of it by the enemy, no longer compatible with our dignity and our oath of making the Constitution respected."

Here was open defiance. Jackson accepted the issue with a promptness all his own. He sent an order to the editor of the paper in which the article appeared, commanding his immediate presence at headquarters. The name of the author of the

communication was demanded and given. It was Mr. Louallier, a member of the LEGISLATURE, a gentleman who had distinguished himself BY HIS ZEAL IN THE PUBLIC CAUSE, and who had been PARTICULARLY PROMINENT IN PROMOTING SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR THE RELIEF OF THE ILL-CLAD SOLDIERS. Upon his surrendering the name, the editor was dismissed. At noon on Sunday, the 5th of March, two days after the publication of the article, Mr. Louallier was walking along the levee, opposite one of the most frequented coffee-houses in the city, when a captain commanding a file of soldiers, tapped him on the shoulder and informed him that he was a prisoner. Louallier, astonished and indignant, called the bystanders to witness that he was conveyed away against his will by armed men. A lawyer, P. L. Morel by name, who witnessed the arrest, ran to the spot, and was forthwith engaged by Louallier to act as his legal adviser in this extremity. Louallier was placed in confinement. Morel hastened to the residence of Judge Dominick A. Hall, Judge of the District Court of the United States, to whom he presented, in his client's name, a petition praying for a writ of *habeas corpus*.

Upon the back of this petition (to the facts of which Morel made affidavit) Judge Hall wrote these words:

Let the prayer of the petition be granted, and the petitioner be brought before me at eleven o'clock to-morrow.

DOM. A. HALL.

March 6th.

Upon receiving this from the hands of the judge, Morel wrote a note to General Jackson to the following effect:

Sir,—I have the honor to inform your excellency that, as counsel, I have made application to his Honor Dom. A. Hall, Judge of the District Court of the U. S., for a writ of *habeas corpus* in behalf of Mr. Louallier, who conceived that he was illegally arrested by order of your excellency; and that the said writ has been awarded, and is returnable to-morrow, 6th instant, at eleven o'clock A. M.

I have the honor to be your excellency's most humble and obedient servant,

P. L. MOREL, Counsellor-at-Law.

General Jackson retorted by writing as follows to Colonel Arbuckle:

New Orleans, March 5th, 1815,
Seven o'clock P. M.

Headquarters, Seventh Military District:

Having received proof that Dominick A. Hall has been aiding and abetting and exciting mutiny within my camp, you will forthwith order a detachment to arrest and confine him, and report to me as soon as arrested. You will be vigilant; the agents of our enemy are more numerous than was expected. You will be guarded against escapes.

A. Jackson, Major-Genl. Comd.

Dr. William E. Butler is ordered to accompany the detachment and point out the man.

A. Jackson, Major-Genl. Comd.

This order was punctually obeyed, and, early in the evening, Judge Hall and Mr. Louallier were prisoners in the same apartment in the barracks.

So far from obeying the writ of *habeas corpus*, General Jackson seized the writ from the officer who served it, and retained it in his own possession, giving to the officer a certified copy of the same. Louallier was at once placed upon his trial before a Court Martial upon the following charges, all based upon the article in the *Louisiana Courier:* exciting to mutiny; general misconduct; being a spy; illegal and improper conduct; disobedience to orders; writing a wilful and corrupt libel against the general; *violation of a general order.*

Judge Hall remained in confinement at the barracks. General Jackson resolved on Saturday the 11th of March, to send the Judge out of the city, and set him at liberty, issuing the following order:

Headquarters, Seventh Military District,
New Orleans, March 11th, 1815.

Sir,—You will detail from your troop a discreet non-commissioned officer and four men, and direct them to call on the officer commanding the Third U. S. Infantry for Dominick A. Hall, who is confined in the guardhouse for exciting mutiny and desertion within the encampment of the city.

Upon the receipt of the prisoner, the non-commissioned officer will conduct him up the coast beyond the lines of General Carroll's encampment, deliver him the enclosed order, and set him at liberty.

Thomas Butler,
Aid-de-Camp.

To Captain Peter N. Ogden,
Commanding Troop of Cavalry.

Captain Ogden promptly obeyed the order. A guard of four privates, commanded by a non-commisioned officer, escorted the learned Judge of the United States District Court to a point about five miles above the city, where General Jackson's order was delivered to him, and he was set free.

On the 31st of March, General Jackson was cited to appear before the United States District Court, for arresting the Judge. The proceedings of the Court are recorded as follows

"On this day appeared in person, Major-General Andrew Jackson, and, being duly informed by the Court that an attachment had issued against him for the purpose of bringing him into Court, and the district attorney having filed interrogatories, the Court informed General Jackson that they would be tendered to him for the purpose of answering thereto. The said General Jackson refused to receive them, or to make any answer to the said interrogatories. Whereupon the Court proceed to pronounce judgment, which was, that Major-General Andrew Jackson do pay a fine of one thousand dollars to the United States."

The General was borne from the Court-room in triumph, or, as Major Eaton has it:

"He was seized and forcibly hurried from the hall to the streets, amidst the reiterated cries of huzza for Jackson, from the immense concourse that surrounded him. They presently met a carriage in which a lady was riding, when, politely taking her from it, the General was made, spite of entreaty, to occupy her place; the horses being removed, the carriage was drawn on and halted at the coffee-house into which he was carried, and thither the crowd followed, huzzaing for Jackson, and menacing violently the Judge. Having prevailed upon them to hear him, he addressed them with great feeling and earnestness; implored them to run into no excesses; that if they had the least gratitude for his services, or regard for him personally, they would evince it in no way so satisfactorily as by assenting, as he most freely did, to the decision which had just been pronounced against him.

"Upon reaching his quarters he sent back an aid-de-camp to the Court-room with a check on one of the city banks for a thousand dollars; and thus the offended majesty of the law was supposed to be avenged."—*Extract from Life of Jackson*, pp. 311 to 320, vol. 2.

Nine years after, this "military despot," who made the "arbitrary arrest," was elected President by the Democracy.

A Piece of Hickory.

THE CONSPIRACY TO SEDUCE THE NORTHWEST.

During the recent occupation of the city of Jackson by the Union army, General J. M. Tuttle, commanding a division in Sherman's Army Corps, made his headquarters at the house of F. T. Cooper, Esq., the editor of the Jackson *Mississippian*. Among the papers which the fugacious editor left behind him, was the following letter from Douglas M. Hamilton, a politician of some note in Louisiana, and his reply thereto. They contain an interesting chapter in the secret history of the rebellion. The originals are in the hands of General Tuttle, subject to the inspection of the curious :

NEW LAUREL HILL POST OFFICE,
WEST FELICIANA, LA., February 21, 1863.

To the Editors of the Mississippian :

Sirs,—In your paper of the 8th inst. is an editorial article to which I desire to call your attention. It is headed "The Future of the Confederate States." This paper, for some reason, failed to come by mail in due season, and arrived at the same time as some of the following week, or I should have called your notice to it sooner. Since that date, you have inserted an article intended for *De Bow's Review*, by "Pathon," and notice the article editorially with favor. Be pleased to inform me candidly, as true men, if you are serious in proposing that any of the free States of the old Union should be admitted into the Confederacy. I can hardly realize that you can be willing to agree to any such proposition, but put forth these propositions as feelers among our own people, and to stimulate the miserable Western Yankees to persevere in their opposition to Lincoln and his Abolition Administration, and by producing dissension, quarrels, and perhaps blows and bloodshed among our common enemy, relieve us in a measure of the tremendous power they are preparing to bring against us.

There is no doubt that our enemy is greatly crippled already by the want unanimity of sentiment and feeling between the people and the army on one side, and the Administration on the

other. And by this private quarrelling among themselves, we have profited a great deal, and will continue to profit until we gain our complete independence, by fostering and encouraging it. But can we not accomplish all that is necessary and proper, and at the same time hold out no promises which in the future we may hesitate to fulfill? I think we can. We can offer to join them, if necessary, in a war against Lincoln, Abolition, and New England Yankees, and after catching and putting to death every public man in the old Union who has been a counsellor or adviser of Lincoln, we can make a treaty of peace and commerce with them, granting them the free navigation of the Mississippi river to its mouth, (a right we never denied them, however,) and moderate privileges of trade with us. But farther than this I would not go, and I hope you would not either.

Your paper, for some reason, is taken as an organ of the President, and these views of yours may be taken as his. Perhaps they are, though I trust not. I was born in Williamson county, Mississippi, near where Jeff. Davis was raised, and my family were schoolmates and friends of his. I, myself, have always esteemed and admired him, and from the beginning of this revolution, have looked upon him as a second Washington to lead our people through it to a successful termination.

But if he favors a reconstruction of a Union of free and slave States, after the experience we have had, I have given him credit for too much penetration and sagacity.

In several public addresses and messages very lately, he has taken occasion to declare most positively and distinctly, that he would never agree under any circumstances to a reconstruction of the old Union. But he has never declared that he never would favor a Union of *slave* and *free* States. He is a man who keeps his own counsel, and talks only when he pleases, keeps silent when he pleases. He may have reserved his opinion for fitting a time for public expression.

I am by nature, education, and religion a Yankee-hater. I loathed the old Union, and no act of any people ever afforded me half the delight that the secession of the slave States from the old Union did. You may imagine, therefore, my chagrin and suprise when I notice in the columns of a leading paper, in

one of the leading secession States, articles advocating a *reconstruction* of the Union. And this at the very crisis of revolution, when our independence, which we have suffered so much for, and fought so gloriously for, is within our grasp, and foreign nations, as well as Yankeedom, are on the point of acknowledging it.

My dear sirs, write to me in reply, and say that you are not in earnest, but are baiting traps to catch green Western Hoosiers. You cannot surely be planning to permit these vermin, uncouth, fanatical, and depraved, as they have proved themselves to be, to enter again our legislative halls, divide our offices of profit and trust, and partake freely of all privileges of our own citizens, of voting, owning property, etc., etc.? You must have learned by the experience of the political agitations of the past twenty-five years, accompanied by hatred, abuse, and jealousy, followed by a war characterized by more outrages, plunderings, burnings, cruelties, indignities, and bloodshed than any on record, that our civilization is too distinct, our instincts too diverse, our manners, habits, thoughts, occupations, and interests too widely different, ever to permit us to live together again under the same government, with the same laws and lawmakers, and the same men to share in making and executing their laws, and administering this government.

I sat down to write you six lines, and find myself entering into an argument with you. Now, I never intended any argument with you on this subject, as men can only argue that about which they hold dissimilar opinions.

Should you continue to write similar editorials to the one alluded to, however, I shall conclude that we do entertain opinions which are separated as far as the poles.

I will not let any of your secrets out of the bag, if you confide them to me, and request me not to divulge them; but allow you to proceed in your baiting for the Hoosiers, and not interfere, though I may not entertain the same notions as to the strict morality of the course. But if you write to me, and say candidly that you are perfectly willing to join them again, and live under the same government and laws, I must take ground against you, and I will spend the balance of my days in fighting against

any union with them, just as I have fought all my past life in trying to get rid of them.

I will fight you honorably, and when I know how you stand, I will enter the list, if in earnest; but if you are not, I will reserve myself for the first public man who broaches this, to me, obnoxious doctrine. Let me hear from you, in reply, at your earliest convenience.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,

DOUGLAS M. HAMILTON.

Reply.

[Private.]

MISSISSIPPIAN OFFICE,
Jackson, March 10th, 1863.

DOUGLAS M. HAMILTON:

Dear Sir,—Your favor of the 21st ult. is received. You are right in your surmise that the article referred to, and similar ones, are written mainly for Western consumption. The papers printed here, go regularly to Western soldiers, by some means, and are not unfrequently republished in Western papers.

From the beginning of the struggle it has been an object with me to draw a distinction between the Western and Eastern soldiers of the North, to give the first credit of all the achievements of Federal arms, and denounce the latter as cowardly, malignant, and intolerant, hoping thereby to produce a division among them, and thus relieve ourselves; and this, it must be confessed, is about the only object I hope to aid in accomplishing by presenting to the West a seeming willingness to admit them into our Confederacy, upon our own forms and conditions.

While there are certain conditions upon which I would not be opposed to their admission—the entire expulsion of abolitionism and fanaticism, the adoption of our constitution, and the unrestrained toleration of slavery—yet I am not wild enough to believe that even the Western States will ever reach this standard, and hence a political brotherhood with them is something I neither expect nor desire. My sole object, therefore, in such editorials as you refer to, is to increase the dissat-

faction now raging in the West, trusting it may soon break out in open rupture. This course, I think, I could defend upon moral grounds, but that is not necessary now.

It is proper to say that I know nothing of the President's views on this subject, and the *Mississippian* (though friendly to him) is not his organ.

Cordially sympathizing with you in hereditary and intense hatred to the true Yankee character,

I am, very respectfully,

E. T. Cooper,

Editor *Mississippian.*

ENGLISH SUSPENSION OF THE HABEAS CORPUS.

It has been, from the outset, the settled aim of the rebel sympathizers and of the anti-war men to weaken, so far as they could, the arm of the Administration. They dared not vindicate the rebellion, and advocate peace with it outright, but what they dared not to do directly they have constantly done indirectly. Not venturing to justify the rebellion, they have yet never ceased to apologize for it, and extenuate it, by denouncing Abolition as its provocation and cause. Not venturing to oppose the war squarely, they have yet sought to disable the Government from prosecuting it by opposing the conscription act, which alone can supply the men, and the financial measures, which alone could supply the means. Their whole public policy has been, not to plant themselves against the war—for that would have been suicidal—but to cripple those who carried on the war.

This factious, traitorous spirit has been particularly displayed in respect to the suspension of the *habeas corpus.* When the rebellion first broke out, Congress not being in session, the President, at his own instance, suspended the writ, and thereby, according to the subsequent statement of Governor Hicks in the United States Senate, prevented at least one State, Maryland, from being carried over to the rebels. Though the legality of his procedure was sustained by Attorney-General

Bates, by Horace Binney, by Reverdy Johnson, and generally by the best constitutional lawyers of the country, the anti-war men straightway denounced it as a monstrous usurpation—clamoring that Congress alone had a right to suspend the writ. This clamor was kept up until finally Congress, not only passed a bill indemnifying the President for the past suspension, but formally authorizing the suspension of the writ for all time during the present. rebellion. But the calculation that this would silence faction failed utterly. There is just as much brawling to-day about the inviolability of *habeas corpus* as there was before the action of Congress. The Copperhead demagogues habitually rant just as if there was no clause in the Constitution providing for the suspension of writ "in cases of insurrection and invasion."

Now, if this balderdash were confined to such windbags as figured at the Union Square meeting the other evening, it would not be worth noticing. But the editors of public journals, who ought to know better, constantly indulge in the same wretched charlatanry. Their readers are daily told that the suspension of the *habeas corpus* is a most intolerable piece of tyranny, which no other people making the least pretension to constitutional freedom would endure for a moment. Charity would impute this to ignorance; but, if ignorance, it is of the very grossest description. For the benefit of the people, who talk so much and know so little of *Magna Charta*, we propose to devote a little space, this morning, to the manner in which England, the native land of *Magna Charta*, deals with a rebellion. It is possible that some of these men may come to understand that war makes some difference in civil rights—that De Lolme, the commentator on the British Constitution, had some idea of what he was writing about when he said, in reference to the suspension of the *habeas corpus*, that "in proportion as a government is in danger it becomes necessary to abridge the liberty of the subject"—and that the framers of our own Constitution were not apostates and tyrants when they inserted a specific clause authorizing the suspension of the writ, "when in cases of rebellion or invasion the public safety may require it."

We shall not stop to make reference to the suspension of

habeas corpus in England at the time of the invasions of the Pretender in 1715 and 1745, nor to the various suspensions in Ireland in 1800—from 1802 to 1805—from 1807 to 1810—in 1814—from 1822 to 1824; but we will confine ourselves to the suspension of the act in 1848, under the direction of statesmen still on the stage. We have nothing to say about the right or the wrong of the Irish attempt at rebellion in that year; it is our purpose simply to show how the English Government met it.

The chronic agitation in Ireland began to take a threatening shape directly after the continental revolutions of February and March; but we believe, even in the December previous, Parliament passed an act forbidding the possession of arms in certain troublesome districts. In April, an act was passed called the "Felony bill," making it felony, among other things, "for any person to compass, imagine or *intend* to depose the Sovereign, or to levy war against her." Under this law, Martin, the editor of *The Felon*, was tried and convicted and sent to Newgate, on account of his writings and public speeches. Other prosecutions of similar character took place. In July, the Whig Ministry, through Lord John Russell, introduced a bill empowering the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and deputies to "apprehend and detain, until 1st of March, 1849, such persons as they shall *suspect* of conspiring against Her Majesty's person and Government." This was a suspension of the act of *habeas corpus* for *all Ireland*—the loyal North as well as the disaffected East and the rebellious South and West. The bill was introduced in the House, and went through all of its stages to its final passage in one day; and on the next day it, in like manner, passed the House of Lords. In both Houses *the vote was unanimous.* Even the Irish members did not vote against it. Even Lucius O'Brien, the brother of the rebel leader, gave it his support. The leaders of all the various parties supported it, though party spirit ran very high at that period.

Said Lord Brougham, in the House of Lords:

"A friend of liberty I have lived, and so I shall die,—nor do I care how soon that may be if I cannot be the friend of liberty without being a friend of traitors at the same time, without

being the protector of criminals, without being deemed to be the accomplice of foul rebellion and its comcomitant civil war, with all of its hideous train of atrocious crimes. It is because I am a friend of liberty that I detest the approach of bloodshed, that I detest the conspiracies which are brewing in the sister isle. The noble Marquis (LANSDOWNE) has informed us that the danger is imminent. Then let the measure which invests the Government with needful, and no more than needful, powers, be immediately adopted."

Lord STANLEY, now Earl DERBY, said:

"I think that the Government has asked for the right remedy. I think the remedy for which they have asked is one which will strike the right persons, and strike them within the right time. I am not one of those who would seek for victims among the credulous dupes of the incendiary agitators of Ireland—dupes who will be put forward in the front ranks for the purpose of committing crimes and outrages. I do not desire—God forbid that I should—that upon them the severest penalty of the law should fall. No; I desire it should fall upon those who, well knowing the consequences of their conduct—who, well knowing the falseness of their pretexts—who, well knowing the fatal effects that must flow from the doctrines they preach, evince a readiness to sacrifice everything to their passions and their sordid interests, and for their own purposes do not hesitate to involve their friendless and too credulous fellow-countrymen in the guilt of treason and the dangers of civil war. The persons I wish to see punished are those who have sufficient skill, who have sufficient information and intelligence to keep themselves free from such legal guilt as would bring them under the operation of the law, with the probability of a conviction, but who, nevertheless, are morally guilty in the eye of God and man of the crime of inciting to treason, murder, rebellion, and civil war. I favor the measure now proposed, chiefly because by its means we shall get rid of all doubts and difficulties—we shall have no more of these delays of the law—no more of that chicanery which encourages evil-doers to hope for ultimate escape, and which is certain to cause such procrastination, that when at length the sword of justice falls, the example does not produce half the effect it ought to have."

In the House of Commons, Lord JOHN RUSSELL said:

"I believe in my conscience that this measure is calculated to prevent insurrection, to preserve internal peace, to preserve

the unity of this empire, and to save the throne of these realms and the free institutions of this country."

Sir Robert Peel said:

"I, for one, am perfectly prepared to insist on no ordinary powers. I believe that the Government is justified in asking for this measure. I believe the measure itself—the power to apprehend on suspicion and keep the conspirators in confinement—is necessary. I will not urge on the Ministry measures of greater coercion than those their own responsibility demands; but this I say, as nothing but necessity can justify a suspension of the *habeas corpus* act, the same necessity makes immediate action desirable."

Mr. Disraeli said:

"I think we ought not to hesitate to grant the Government the great and extraordinary powers for which they ask."

Mr. Joseph Hume, the leader of the Liberals, and always the fast friend of Ireland, said that he should

—"be sorry to see any division on the measure now before the House."

The only fault found with the Ministers in the entire debate, was that they had not proposed the measure weeks and months before. And yet, even at that time, not a hostile gun had been fired in Ireland, nor an armed demonstration of any sort made. It was simply the shadow of a rebellion—a rebellion which a week afterwards was put to flight by fifty armed policemen, and breathed its last gasp in Widow Carmick's cabbage garden; it was simply the shadow of this thing that stirred Parliament to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* by unanimous vote. And yet, while our own Government is confronted with a rebellion involving seven millions of persons, and, commanding an army of seven hundred thousand men, the vocabulary of abuse is exhausted because it has presumed to suspend the writ; and to bring their audacity to a climax, English liberty is put in contrast with American despotism.—*N. Y. Times.*

CURSES COMING HOME TO ROOST.

Considering the length of time which Copperhead politicians managed to look on, if not with satisfaction, at least with contentment and in silence, at the practical suspension of the *habeas corpus* throughout the entire South before this war broke out; considering the placid approval or indulgence with which they witnessed, for nearly forty years, the nullification by every one of the Slave States of that essential and vital clause of the Constitution which guarantees to every citizen of the United States freedom of speech and trial by jury all over the Union; considering the eagerness wtih which they supported those provisions of the Fugitive Slave act which shamefully set aside the time-honored presumption of the common law, that every man is free till the contrary is proved, and imposed on the people of the Northern States the humiliation of seeing persons who might be their fellow-citizens carried into life-long bondage on the dictum, not even of a Court, but of a Commissioner—we cannot, for the life of us, much as we value forms, and much as we respect honest human lamentations, help taking a little dismal pleasure in the sight of their present griefs. When we remember that when Slavery daily and hourly either trampled our laws under foot or wrested them for the confusion or destruction of liberty, and for the deification of brute force, these men deprecated all protest and all indignation, we have no bowels of compassion for them, in their present affliction. Seeing how much violence and illegality they could endure for the benefit of Slavery, we know that they can endure very much more than they have yet encountered for the benefit of freedom. They are shocked by Judge Leavitt's refusal of a *habeas corpus* to Vallindigham—they, who thought it no shame that a Washington Judge should simply fine Brooks $300 for beating in the skull of a United States Senator in the Senate Chamber itself. They are horrified that a man may not in the North say his say in favor of peace—they who applauded for long years the system which forbade any man to say, in two-thirds of the Southern States, one word against Slavery, and who voted with the men who upheld this system as the

highest political good. When Northern men, or non-slaveholders, were tarred and feathered and robbed every month, not by the sentence even of courts-martial, but by the wild will of ruffianly mobs, the voices that are now so eloquent on behalf of law and order, did nothing but shout approval. Not one note of protest or of warning ever came from them; not one syllable did they ever utter, to admonish the nation of the demoralization which familiarity with such unchecked wickedness and illegality was sure in the long run to work. It is awful, now, forsooth, that men may not preach against war, under the protection of the Constitution; but it was simple and natural, that under that same Constitution no man dared say a word against either the morality or economy of treating the whole laboring population of one-half the Union as beasts of the field.

They are much troubled, just now, that their labors in defence of Constitutional forms, their invectives against arbitrary arrests and martial law, do not meet with a better response from the public, and do not produce much effect on the Government, and they want to know the reason why. We can tell them. It is because their zeal is new born. People naturally doubt the sincerity of defenders and expounders of the Constitution who, until it began to be strained on behalf of freedom, saw it set aside without a word of remonstrance. People cannot forget, if they would, that the saints who are now on the battlements, fighting vigorously in defence of it, managed to look on in silence during the reigns of Buchanan and Pierce, when every law on the statute book, and every provision of the Constitution, which interfered with the spread or maintenance of slavery, were openly and shamefully disregarded. And there is not an honest man at the North who must not feel disgusted by the impudence which professes to see in the events of to-day proofs of the "decadence of the Republic," and which, nevertheless, in the days of the Toombs's and Wigfalls, saw nothing to be feared or regretted, save the speeches of the Abolitionists—in a state of things which converted this nation into the one apostle and defender of human bondage, to be found in the civilized world—which made the very name of American a synonym amongst foreign nations for lawless violence, and which made the friends of freedom all

over the earth blush over us as a scandal and disgrace. The best thing that could have been said for us at that day was, that we were strong; the better thing may be said for us to-day that we are strong and right. Our violations of law at that day were committed in the service of villainy; they are to-day committed in the service of humanity. We now, it is true, suspend the *habeas corpus*, but it is, that for the future, truth, and justice, and freedom may be established on a sure and lasting foundation. We are, thank God, at last risking our liberties—if we are risking them at all—for something better than Southern "property." Whatever we sacrifice either of our law or Constitution is sacrificed for the gratification of a nobler passion than a thirst for "niggers." And if we perish, we shall perish with the satisfaction—which, had our end come in the days when Copperhead demagogues held the reins of government, we could not possibly have enjoyed—of knowing that we have not destroyed our Government in the interest of kidnappers and pirates, but in a noble effort to find some better basis for a great nation than base connivance at a great crime.—*N. Y. Times.*

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 21.

LETTER

ADDRESSED TO THE

Opera House Meeting,

CINCINNATI,

BY

COL. CHARLES ANDERSON.

NEW YORK:
WM. C. BRYANT & CO., PRINTERS, 41 NASSAU ST., COR. LIBERTY.

1863.

Col. Charles Anderson, the author of this letter, is a native of Kentucky, and a brother of General Robert Anderson of the U. S. Army. At the inception of the rebellion, he resided in San Antonio, in Western Texas, and made all the opposition in his power to the movement. One of his speeches, which was then published and circulated, produced a most telling effect. Finding that, owing to the treachery of Gen. Twiggs, the Unionists of Texas, who were in a decided majority, were borne down, Col. Anderson promptly disposed of his elegant residence and his other property, at a great sacrifice, and set out with his family to leave the country within the forty days allowed by the rebel government. While on his journey, he was arrested without any charge having been preferred against him, separated from his wife and family, who had to proceed on their way to Mexico without his protection, brought back to a camp near San Antonio, and kept in such strict confinement, that none of his friends could see him, and take steps for obtaining his release by process of law. Not long after, he escaped by night, and by hard riding crossed the Rio Grande. He was so fortunate as to overtake his family at Vera Cruz, whence he proceeded to Dayton, Ohio, where he has since made his residence. After a brief visit to the Old World, he returned, was appointed Colonel of one of the Ohio regiments, and was wounded, fighting gallantly at its head, under Rosecrans, at Stone River. Having been prostrated by an acute disease resulting from the exposure incident to camp life, he was compelled to resign his command and return home, not expecting to live. He has recovered, and has since been nominated by the Union men of Ohio, as their candidate for the Lieutenant-Governorship in opposition to George E. Pugh, who is the nominee of the copperheads.

LETTER.

Gentlemen,—I wish exceedingly, that I were able to attend and address the Union meeting at Pike's Opera House. I wish yet more, that I could feel able to do greatly better, than only to speak in such a cause. In default of my ability to do either, I have concluded to comply with your other invitation, by writing thus fully my own opinions and feelings in regard to our national crisis. I trust that others may see that I am justified by that crisis and my own position, in this proceeding.

Some of our fellow-citizens tell us that an armistice will bring us peace, and that peace will lead to reunion. If the rebels were in the enjoyment of a popular or free government, all this might be possible. But, in point of clear fact, the whole Southern people are now lying abjectly under a despotism the most absolute and unmitigated upon the globe. In consequence of this truth, this proposal is asking us to place our confidence in the identical conspirators and villians who first plotted this treason—the same oligarchs who now, by force of arms, domineer over a people once the proudest and freest of our age. This is asking us, with our special experiences with them as individuals, to intrust these, the most cunning of all conspirators, the most faithless of all traitors in the course of all history, with time, place, and opportunity to refresh and reinforce themselves for a renewal of their energies in the same and other bad purposes and plans. And we must not, for an instant, overlook or forget what are these plans and purposes. Having been detected and foiled in their plots, slowly and slyly to debase our Republican Government into a modified and overgrowing oligarchy, they now strive, at once and by force, to establish it pure

and simple, and based, too, in their very Constitution, directly and expressly upon slave property and slave representation. Be not deceived, This war is chiefly a war between two great and irreconcilable antagonists, in form and spirit—the principle of Republicanism on our side, against that of actual, literal, unmixed oligarchy upon theirs. And what a contrast it is! It is the best, at least the most honest, form of government exemplified in history or known to philosophy, warring in a life or death contest with the most faithless, cunning, despotic, and corrupt. And yet, are we now asked by fellow-citizens among ourselves—I wish I could add, of ourselves—to give to such individuals (engaged in the very act of organizing and establishing such a principle and form of government, through such a plot) a respite, breathing time, armistice, treaties! Yes, we are earnestly besought to give time, place, opportunity, and temptation, to the most cunning of conspirators further again to conspire; to the cruelest of murderers, once more and by wholesale, to slay the innocent; to the basest of traitors, more and worse, (if that were possible,) to betray their country and their countrymen of all sections and throughout all time.

But we are told by their apologists and friends that these despotisms over the Southern people need not greatly concern us. I beg leave to differ from, and protest against this terrible delusion. I omit any special comment here, upon the very direct interest we all have in resisting their establishment of any separate government, in these important matters, viz.: of the boundaries to be fixed between us; of the States and Territories, with their loyal people, which we must remorselessly abandon to their tyrannies; of the national artery of commerce and the great Gulf, which they are to environ and choke up; of the foreign maritime master whom they *must* invoke—like another King Stork—and will convert from a customer and friend into a neighbor-rival and neighbor-foe to ourselves; and furthermore, of the border wars, and the fugitive slave-wars which would vex our industry, destroy our property, desolate our lands, and almost exterminate our people, through all the generations to come. These interests of ours in this tremendous issue, have been, heretofore, sufficiently noted, perhaps, by myself, and others.

But, if they were each and all as improbable as they will be, alas, the certain consequences of disunion, I have yet other motives for pressing this terrible war, without pause or respite, on, unceasingly on, to its ultimate and fixed result. It is plain to me,—nothing is more obvious,—that an oligarchy, based upon slave property and slave representation, must, from its essential nature, and especially with it peculiar history, and amidst its peculiar circumstances, possess two conditions. It will be compelled to have a territorial expanse for the diffusion of its excesses of negro population. Otherwise, inasmuch as the whole theory and practice of their plantation life presuppose and require many slaves to few masters, by the mere law of population, there must come a period, when the multitudes of the negroes, however dull and docile, will be too strong in brute force to be held down by the superincumbent or master-race, however cunning and cruel it may be, or may become. In default of this right and power of diffusing this negro race, such a government and people must have another remedy—and that is a vast and disproportioned standing army, to repress its servile insurrections, as long as may be possible. Indeed, their government and society must, naturally and necessarily, be (what Mr. Calhoun designated) compounded alone of modern Spartans, all ever armed and exercised in war, and hereditary Helots, all degraded, more and more, as their numbers shall increase, into the most abject servitude and barbarism. Nor is this all. The latter condition can afford no sufficient remedy for the danger. No depth of cunning in their politicians—no strength, or courage, or cruelty, in their armies—can repress or postpone those simple laws and processes by which the human family increases. The more numerous race, restrained from migration by its color and condition—black slaves within the limits of slavholding States—must, generation after generation, more and more outnumber the less and lessening numbers of the free, white race. The latter will not be merely unrestrained from migration, but must be compelled by various causes and in great numbers, to depart from such a country. Now, when that time shall arrive, or shall even approach, what will this cunningest and most daring of all kinds of government be obliged to undertake? They are brave by blood. They will

be inured to arms and to unchecked dominion. They will be forced to choose, between the expulsion or diffusion of their domestic danger and the being wholly submerged, under an inundation of blood in the inevitable slave revolts. While we, by supposition, may be a Republican people, engaged in the works and ways of honest industry and quiet peace, as brave in nature as they, our kinsmen, but as unschooled in the cunning of oligarchies as unskilled in the arts of warfare. What would they do? The answer is obvious. They would, if we should remain a free and pacific people, invade, conquer, and possess us and our all. But the supposition is untenable. We, in our turn, (though without their domestic and peculiar necessity,) would be compelled to maintain forever a vast standing army. And this continuing necessity will have been made indispensable by this proposed, recommended, urged, treaty of disunion. Now, this perpetual standing army will not simply entail upon us—as it ever has upon all governments of every form which has kept one—a monstrous national debt, and an endless and boundless taxation. It will do far worse. It will directly convert our Government into a Military Republic. I have said, that separation will constitute them into the worst possible form of government. Ours will only be next to the worst. Under its miseries, we should all devoutly pray for King, Lords, and Bishops, even without Commons, as the chiefest of earthly blessings.

I have yet another reason why I could not assent to an armistice, or to pause at all in this colossal war, even if I had made up my mind that the Union was lost, and that the Confederacy must soon become a separate government. Even in that case, we must, unless we are downright fools, fight on until we shall have, at the last, disabled our adversary from ruining, or seriously injuring us in the future. They have broken the ice. The disagreeable task is upon our hands. Let us finish the work now, while we are hardening our hearts and schooling our arms in the dreadful duty. If the South must be either an independency, or the dependency of England, we ought, at least, to start her forth in her new career, in a shape and of a substance to harm us as little as may be, in the long hereafter.

In my philosophy, as in my charity, the duty is a double one.

——"*Parcere subjecti*
Et debellare superbos."

And I know, that the South has not been bled half enough yet, for that healthy reform. I think it best, also, that the South and her aiders and abettors should clearly understand this terrible necessity, as another of the results of their "peaceable" and amiable secession.

Others, again, would reconcile us to a permanent secession. They tell us that we might, or could, or may, or ought, or must, ("or some other such ambiguous givings-out,") unite the great Northwest with the destinies of the Southern Confederacy. And, truly, I suppose we could. So, too, doubtless, any Christian gentleman who chooses, can, and may, strangle or poison his beautiful, diligent, virtuous, intelligent, amiable, and lawful wife, and then unite his destinies with the most filthy, diseased, abandoned harlot he can find in the alleys. His power to do this thing, is just the same as it is for the great Northwest to do the other. While this private union of destinies would be altogether more virtuous and more respectable in the eyes of God and man than that of the free, youthful, giant republic, like another Samson, forming "a more perfect union" with a diseased, heartless, faithless, dependent oligarchy, like another Delilah, revived from the stews of old Venice, to seduce us from our interest, our virtue, and our glory. Alas! for this age of grand things and little men! One scarcely knows whether most to despise the statesmanship, which proposes this new Union, or to abhor the treason that would destroy the old. It is gravely suggested to ten millions of freemen, occupying the grandest inheritance of the globe, and lying in the heart of the continent, to fence *themselves* in, by foreign nations, and to erect toll-gates betwixt themselves and the broad Atlantic on this straight highway into the great free world before them. They have set on foot schemes and plots, in order to compel *themselves*, in all coming time, to carry on their visits of commerce and Christianity by the back alley, around the corner of Louisiana, and (the British navy permitting it) through the

gateway of Havana and the Tortugas, which Spain, and a yet more despicable despotism and government—the Southern Confederacy—will have to set up in the mouth of the Gulf.

These are some of the "policies" which modern American statesmanship coolly advocates in open argument, and which modern American treason, in the dark K. G. C. lodges, secretly plots to put into active practice. And let us see to what depths of villainy the treason of this age and section can plunge. It proposes to the great Northwest, in the first place, *secession!* "What! are you *there*, old Trupenny?" So soon in the *second* act of disintegration? And when shall follow the third, fourth, fifth, down to the thirty-third of the series? And when—more fatal yet—will commence this disintegration of those contemptibly small units into their elementary particles? For, be it remembered, that when the uniting hoops of the Heidleburg tun shall be cut asunder, that grandest of vessels will not part into its lesser and useful likes. It must tumble into a chaos of mere firewood staves. To use a nobler figure, when the carelessness of watchmen, or the treason of the Admiral shall, by a spark to the magazine, explode the mighty ribs of our glorious ship of State—"The Constitution"—it will not burst into some thirty odd units of jolly little life-boats, gaily dancing upon the smooth sea. No, indeed. The ocean will lose color and grace, by the strewn wrecks of her broken fragments, that shall disfigure and disgrace its navigation. No more—while the forms and spirit of Republican Government remain to us—can secessionism pause, either in its peaceful dissolutions, or in its turbulent explosions, at the lines of State unity. On the contrary, districts and counties will be subdivided and separated, until at last (but for one remedy) society itself would be dissolved into a chaos of confusion and wars, worse than the primitive barbarism. That one remedy would be, the taking shelter by all, through the several impulses and necessities of each, under the shadows of a monarchy. That alone could stop and cure the ruinous exercise of "this right of secession, which appertains to every people, through the fundamental law of self-government." Do our ultra Democratic Peace brethren (like the Confederate K. G. C.'s) steer for that haven? It would really seem so.

The Southern oligarchs cry, "Let us alone. Let us try a separate existence for four or five hundred years, as the Germans and Italians did," This is their reply to what is called the *water-shed argument.* It is very plausible, but impudently fallacious. These happy people did not break into their contemptible unities, through civil broils about hereditary negro slavery. Nor have they continuously experienced this ever-living and ever-increasing cause of war betwixt themselves, as foreign nations. As for the Germans; what would be, if the whole race were one nation, by far the foremost nation and government of all this world, is now, notwithstanding the extraordinary civilization and learning of its many nationalities, almost contemptible as a power. But our great question is: how have they kept the peace? Emperors, kings, princes, graffs, &c., with huge standing armies and insufferable taxation, have repressed their "border wars."

As for Italy, while they were Republics, their wars were the most constant, fierce and disgraceful of history. They were compelled to seek repose in the enforced quietude of their countless savage little despotisms. And thus another race, the first in genius of all others, has, through secession, brought itself to the very lowest point of degradation in Christendom. Rare examples, truly! "Let us," say they, "only for four or five centuries, try these experiments of Germany and Italy upon ourselves and you!" No. The plain law of human government is this: Neighbor republics cannot keep the peace. If there were no fugitive slaves nor horses to break limits and compel collisions, the sectional and national jealousies of the people, in a form of government wherein the thoughts and passions of the people make—are—the public law, inevitably break out into wars. A superincumbent, monarchial power can alone repress these passions and this consequence. I, for one, have not become so amiable, nor so debased, as to lie supinely under that heavy weight, in order to gratify these experimentalists, who have become morbid and insane in the mere indulgence of their own arrogance. The risk and the sacrifice of the experiment are too costly.

Such, then, are the changes to which we are urged by these peacemakers. However others may consider these results of

disunion and of Southern independence, they appear to me absolutely inevitable in their occurrence, and unendurable in the experience. I fully agree with that ablest thinker and firmest patriot now left us, Dr. Breckinridge, that in preference to some of these fates, it were far better that our nation should again begin its career with its first pair of pilgrims. Any fate—even universal death—rather than protracted wars, which will extirpate civilization and humanity from this fair land, and only be concluded in a peace which shall fasten chains upon our entire race. As for me, I should prefer to see this dreadful war go on, without a pause, until the last *white* man who is able to bear arms in the cause of the Union shall have impaled himself upon their last bayonet, before we shall consent to a division of this Union, or even an armistice for its discussion.

Do any suspect me, in all this, of possessing in general a spirit of ferocity, or a special sentiment of vengeance, toward the Southern people? I protest that no man ever did suffer more at seeing or contemplating the ruins and miseries of war than I do at these now before and around us. I declare, that every feeling of resentment at my personal injuries at their hands has long ago vanished from my heart, and has given place to tenderest pity for the Southern people in their sufferings and their prospects. And I must in frankness admit that, as in my earlier years, I still admire and love the Southern people in many of their traits of character, more than I do any other. But I do not love or admire their treason; nor do I so love or admire themselves, their slavery, or their slaves, as to make myself and mine the perpetual victims and slaves of either. Nor, could I comprehend how any man, disentangled from these ties of interest and prejudice which so enthral the Southerners, can see these things differently, if I did not recognise, in the paradox, a law of human nature, long and often exemplified in its history. It is this:

The Israelites in the wilderness often murmured against Moses and God, saying, "Let us alone that we may serve the Egyptians! for it had been better for us to serve the Egyptians than that we should die in the wilderness. * * * Would to God that we had died by the hand of the Lord in Egypt, when we sat by the flesh-pots, and when we did eat to the

full." The truth might as well be told now as at any later period. The democratic party of the North has been placed and continued in its political ascendencies, wholly by its alliance with the South, and by its generally unconscious subserviency to Southern interests and Southern prejudices. Is it strange, then, that many of its leaders should still murmur at this loss of their power? Is it an uncommon trait of human nature, especially of *bad* human nature, to show rage and malignity over a great loss, even when it has become irrecoverable? Let us not be surprised or dismayed therefore—human nature being as it is—that so many democratic leaders are still found murmuring in this our dreary pilgrimage to the promised land, for their lost flesh-pots in Egypt. The wonder rather is, how many—very many—wiser and nobler leaders and fathers of that honored old party have been enabled, in the very spirit of their own brave and noble Douglas, to tear their hearts and memories from the dear party ties that so long have bound them, and to leap, like lions, into the arena of combat and death, and to the defense of that palladium, which contains all that can make even democracy valuable or precious to them.

I should be sorry if these reflections should make any one believe that I have become a party-man. Lest such mistake should become an offense and a stumbling-block to others, I must declare that I am and expect to be neither a republican nor a democrat. In the past, I hold the latter party entirely responsible for this secession and its civil wars; in the present, I esteem its rival party guilty of many sins of omission and commission, which must go very far toward making that ruin (began by the other) utterly remediless and hopeless. That I do not openly specify and boldly denounce them, is not, by any means, because I approve them or succumb to them. It is only because I will not, while that party is legitimately wielding the energies of *my* nation in a struggle for its very life, either say, write, or do anything to impede its action, or to encourage and strengthen our enemy. And, so far as either of these parties—as parties—is concerned, I am quite free to say these common truths of both. The one is no better than the other. By this tremendous hurricane in the air, and this huge upheavel of the earth, neither of them has been, for any due period of time,

at all elevated above the level of its low party passions and purposes, and up to that exalted summit of patriotism and wisdom to which our national crisis calls them. We must all—republicans, democrats, and fossil whigs—differently and better understand and feel toward this revolution of principles and systems, before we can be truly efficient in our grand work.

No more would I be thought to have changed my views and feelings toward slavery and its remedies. I am not, and never expect to be an Abolitionist *within the Union*. But, as I never did admire or praise, nor profess to admire slavery "in the abstract," or slavery when weighed in the balance with this Union or our history, or its other inestimable blessings, I certainly shall not, now that slavery, *as a political power*, has begun this cruel war upon them all, elevate it into the chief place of idols, upon the altars of my political and religious worship. For one, I am still perfectly willing that the slave States may all return to the safe fold of the Union, with all their olden rights under their several Constitutions and that of the United States. I am willing—yes, anxious—for them so to return, with any and every advantage which the reformed public and social opinions of our fellow-citizens can afford them. I should not at all object (if they are such fools as to ask and exercise that privilege) to their traveling and visiting with their slaves among us, without let or hindrance from laws, officers, or mobs. I wish them to enjoy these and all other privileges, *which shall not enslave, nor tend to enslave our white race!* But as I was not willing that they should break down or overleap the Missouri Compromise, and the various other compromises, in order, by debasing our Republic into an Oligarchy, to rule over our children with an arrogance if possible worse than that in which they had domineered over us, so, I would not now, nor hereafter, agree for them to start again in the same career of encroachments through the political powers of slavery. And, sick at heart and wearied in frame, as I now am, at the sight and contemplation of this war, I am not yet outwinded in that contest. And I furthermore think it is well enough for all of us, who yearn for peace, to let those who sympathize with us in that desire—both in the South and North—know at once and for all, that we will not have peace at the cost of all those

blessings which alone can make it worthy, nor even Union in peace, if we must have it, on the condition of exchanging our Republic—the Republic of our fathers—for their Oligarchy, infused with the despotic arrogance of a cotton aristocracy.

As to slavery *out of the Union;* whenever I shall be discharged, by secession, from all constitutional obligations in regard to it, I shall, of course, hold and treat it as I suppose any other foreigner would do, in a war between it and his country—according as I may, in the given emergency, think best and most honorable for my own nation.

These reflections of mine have run out to such an immoderate length, that I hesitate to send them. My heart is so full of this great cause, that I could not, in reality, suppress its utterances in their free flow, and I have not now the time to make them briefer and better, by retrenchment. Others from the army will, doubtless, address your meeting more directly with relation to the peculiar relations which our brave soldiers bear to these great questions. Knowing that they could so speak, not only with higher authority, but with more effect than myself, I have written only as a simple citizen.

God save our nation!

CHARLES ANDERSON.

The Loyal Publication Society has already issued a large number of Slips and Pamphlets which have been widely circulated. Amongst the most important are the following:

No. 1 *Future of the North West*, by Robert Dale Owen.
2 *Echo from the Army.*
3. *Union Mass Meeting, Speeches of Brady, Van Buren, &c.*
4. *Three Voices; the Soldier, Farmer and Poet.*
5. *Voices from the Army.*
6. *Northern True Men.*
7. *Speech of Major-General Butler.*
8. *Separation; War without End.* Ed. Laboulaye.
9. *The Venom and the Antidote.*
10. *A few words in behalf of the Loyal Women of the United States*, by One of Themselves.
11. *No Failure for the North.* Atlantic Monthly.
12. *Address to King Cotton.* Eugene Pelletan.
13. *How a Free People conduct a long War.* Stillé.
14. *The Preservation of the Union, a National Economic necessity.*
15. *Elements of Discord in Secessia, &c., &c.*
16. *No Party now, but all for Our Country.* Francis Lieber.
17. *The Cause of the War.* Col. Charles Anderson.
18. *Opinions of the Early Presidents, and of the Fathers of the Republic upon Slavery, and upon Negroes as Men and Soldiers.*
19. Einheit und Freiheit, von Hermann Raster.
20. *Military Despotism! Suspension of the Habeas Corpus! Curses coming home to roost!*

Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No. 863 Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 22.

EMANCIPATION IS PEACE.

BY ROBERT DALE OWEN.

We want peace. We desire to see an end of this war. Its bloodshed, its crimes, the desolation that follows in its track, the evil passions it engenders—these are an offense against civilization, a breach of the principles which lie at the base of Christianity. Such a war, between men of the same race, language, religion, is a disgrace to the nineteenth century.

We are tired of war. We want peace! But what sort of peace do we desire, and how shall we obtain it?

Do we want peace in the shape of a suspension of hostilities? Are we satisfied if we obtain a truce, to be followed after a few months, or a few years, during which the rebels, taking breath, shall arm and fortify themselves afresh, by a new and more bitter contest? Do we want peace for ourselves, to result in war for our children?

Shortsighted and selfish is such a policy. Selfish, for he deserves not the name of parent who would shuffle off danger and suffering for the moment, that these may fall, with double force, on his children after him; and shortsighted, because, if this insurrection is to be put down with the least sacrifice of human life, it must be stricken now, confined, blockaded, exhausted as it is, not allowed time and opportunity to renew its energies and recruit its resources.

We lack not manhood only, but that parental instinct which renders dumb beasts courageous, if we are satisfied with any peace but that which shall be permanent—if we are satisfied with any arrangement to terminate this war, that shall not extend to the next generation as well as to the present.

How and when are we to obtain such a peace? Never, until we shall have eradicated the cause of the war.

The secessionists themselves have told us in terms so plain that he who runs may read, what *are* the causes of this war.

South Carolina, in her official "Declaration of Causes," concurred in afterwards by each seceding State, spoke thus: "All hope of remedy is rendered vain by the fact, that the public opinion of the North has invested a great political error with the sanctions of a more erroneous religious belief." She tells us, in the same document, what *is* this "great political error." The Northern States, she says, "have denounced as sinful the institution of slavery." Her corner-stone doctrine, in opposition, was honestly given, March 21, 1863, by the Vice-President of Secessiondom, (Alexander H. Stephens,) as follows: "Slavery is the natural and moral condition of the negro. This, our new Government, is the first, in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and moral truth."

South Carolina, sustained by every seceding State, tells us, that peace is hopeless until we discard our "great political error," and adopt their "great philosophical and moral truth." And these are no idle words. They have been backed by brave deeds; they have been maintained on the part of the rebels, by the sacrifice of millions of treasure and tens of thousands of lives.

It is plain as the sun at noonday, that with such a people, there are but two roads to peace of any kind—the one to recognize as the basis of Government the "philosophical truth" that slavery is the natural and moral condition of the negro; the other, to extirpate the institution, the parent and source of the stupendous falsehood, which, for eighty years past, has lurked and rankled in our political system, to culminate, at last, in the most gigantic rebellion the world ever saw.

The first of these roads—to what sort of peace will it lead

us? Let the North, belying the courage she has shown on the battle-field, casting behind her the last remnant of self-respect, deaf alike to the warnings of Revolutionary wisdom, and to the voice of civilization speaking to-day in her ears, consent to Secessiondom's new basis of government, now for the first time in the history of the world shamelessly put forth; and, whether as one nation, or as two, what are the inevitable results? We shall not avoid them by shutting our eyes. Let us look them boldly in the face.

Conceive reunion, with slavery still in existence. Imagine Southern sympathizers in power among us, offering compromises. Suppose the South, exhausted with military reverses, and desiring a few years' armistice to recruit, decides to accept it under the guise of peace and reconstruction? What next? Thousands of slaves, their excited hopes of emancipation crushed, fleeing across the border. A fugitive slave law, revived by peace, demanding their rendition. Popular opinion in the North opposed to the law, and refusing the demand. Renewed war the certain consequence.

Or take even the alternative of recognition—recognition of an independent confederacy, still slave-holding. Are we, then —becoming the sole exception among the nations of the earth —to make ourselves aiders and abettors of the slave system of a foreign nation, by agreeing to return to her negro refugees seeking liberty and an asylum among us? National self-respect imperatively forbids this. Public sentiment would compel the rejection, as a base humiliation, of any proposed treaty stipulation, providing for rendition of runaway slaves. Yet the South would regard such rejection in no other light than as a standing menace—a threat to deprive her of what she regards as her most valuable property. Coterminous as for hundreds—possibly thousands—of miles our boundaries would be, must not the South, in common prudence, maintain all along that endless border line an armed slave police? Are we to consent to this? And if we do, shall we escape border raids after fleeing fugitives? No sane man will expect it. Are we to suffer these? We are disgraced. Are we to resent them? It is a renewal of hostilities.

Whether the South returns to her allegiance, retaining her

slave system, or whether we recognize her independence with her new basis of government, the ultimate result, as regards peace, will be the same. Three years of breathing time will not elapse without bringing endless quarrels and another rebellion.

The second of these roads may seem rough and hard to travel; but we must either travel it, or abandon all hopes of enduring peace. We must fight the battle out. We can rid ourselves of a great evil in one way only—by eradicating its cause. The price of peace is emancipation.

But if emancipation is to avail us as a peace measure, we must adopt it boldly, resolutely, effectually. It must be general, not partial; extending not to the slaves of rebels only, but to every slave on this continent. Even if it were practicable, which it is not, with slavery non-existent in the Northern States and abolished in those which persist in rebellion, to maintain it in the narrow border-strip, it is precisely there where negro fugitives can the most readily escape, that its maintenance would the most certainly lead to war.

The President's Proclamation has nobly paved the way, but that is all it has done. And, as it is confessedly based on the war power and justified by military necessity, there is the chance that the Supreme Court, if still in the hands of the slave power, when peace supervenes, may declare it inoperative. An Act of Emancipation is needed to endorse that Proclamation and enlarge its operation; a sanction of that great measure by the National Legislature under the solemn form of law.

The constitutional power of Congress to enact such a law admits of no reasonable doubt. The powers to lay and collect taxes, to exercise authority over forts and arsenals of the United States, to suppress insurrection, and various others equally essential, are expressly given by the Constitution to Congress. It is the right and duty of Congress to carry these powers into effect. In case of obstruction or defeat of existing laws framed to that intent, it is the right and duty of Congress to select such means and pass such additional laws as may be necessary and proper to overcome such obstruction and enforce obedience to such laws. In the selection of the means to effect this consti-

tutional object, Congress is the sole judge of their propriety or necessity. These means must not be prohibited by the Constitution; but whether they are the most prudent or the most effectual means, or in what degree they are necessary, are matters over which the Supreme Court has no jurisdiction. Chief Justice Marshall, in a celebrated decision, declared: "The Government, which has a right to do an act, and has imposed upon it the duty of performing that act, must, according to the dictates of reason, be allowed to select the means."

Now, the laws are obstructed in the insurrectionary States; in those States, and only in those States, where slavery exists; in other words, where life-long claims to the service or labor of negroes are held; the insurrectionary acts of these States being avowedly based on the allegation that the preservation of slavery can only be ensured by secession.

It will further be admitted that Congress has the right (Amendments to Constitution, Article 5) to take private property, with just compensation made, for public use. And it will not be argued that a claim of one inhabitant of the United States to the service of another, whether for a term of years or for life, is property which has been constitutionally exempted from such appropriation. It is evident that if a claim to the service of a slave cannot constitutionally be so taken and cancelled, neither can the claim to the service of an apprentice.

But if Congress believes that, in order to enforce law and suppress insurrection, it is necessary and proper to take and cancel all claims to life-long service or labor held in the Slave States, and if claims to service or labor, whether for years or for life, held by one inhabitant of the United States against another, be a species of property not specially exempted by the Constitution from seizure for public use, then an Act of Emancipation is strictly constitutional.

Is such an act expedient, as well as constitutional? We hear it often said, even by the enemies of slavery, that its days are numbered; that the Southern Institution is tottering to its downfall, and will die out of itself, if we but let it alone. There is not an evil that curses the earth of which the same thing cannot be said: all abuses have but a limited life; the truth, only, is eternal.

But is that a reason why we should sit with our hands across, idly looking on? God does his work, but he does it through the agency of good, active men and women. He helps those who help themselves. *Why* are the days of slavery numbered? Because of the brave blows that have been struck against it. How shall it be eradicated? By the same process by which it was doomed. By continuing to strike such blows. By continuing to work against it, until it ceases to exist. Up to this hour, the measures taken to subdue it have been partial only. Let us complete the work.

Those who demur to the passage of an act which meets the great difficulty before us broadly, effectually, honestly, and in accordance with the dictates of Christianity and civilization, would do well to consider whether, in the progress of this insurrectionary upheaval, we have not reached a point at which there is no prudent alternative left. By the President's Proclamation, some three millions of slaves have been already declared free. Sundry laws of Congress have emancipated several hundred thousands more. There remain legally enslaved probably less than three-quarters of a million—chiefly scattered along a narrow border-strip that is coterminous, North and South, with Freedom or Emancipation—partly dotted in isolated parishes or counties, surrounded by enfranchised slaves. Can we maintain in perpetuity so anomalous a condition of things? Clearly not. At every step embarrassments innumerable obstruct our progress. No industry, no human sagacity, would suffice to determine the ten thousand conflicting questions that must arise out of such a chaos. Must the history of each negro be followed back, so as to determine his *status*, whether slave or free? If negroes emancipated in insurrectionary States are sold as slaves into Border States, or into excepted parishes or counties, can we expect to trace the transaction? If slaves owned in Border States, or in excepted parishes or counties, are sold to loyal men in insurrectionary States, are they still slaves? or do they become free? Are we to admit, or to deny, the constitutionality of Border-State laws, which arrest and imprison as vagrants, and sell into slavery to pay expenses of arrest and imprisonment, free negro emigrants from insurrectionary States? But why multiply instances? The longer this twilight

of groping transition lasts, it will be only confusion the worse confounded.

God's work is yet incomplete. The least you can do in aid of it is to give to it your personal influence and your name. And then, when you shall have lent a helping hand, it will be time enough to sit down and to hope that the evil which threatens the very existence of this nation will be, not doomed only, but destroyed at last.

☞ *Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No.* 863 *Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.*

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY,

No. 23.

LETTER OF PETER COOPER,

ON

SLAVE EMANCIPATION.

New York, January, 1862.

Abraham Lincoln, *President of the United States:*

Honored and Respected Sir,—The deplorable scenes through which our country is now passing form my only apology for venturing to send you a few lines, desiring, if possible, to strengthen the arm of Government by any and all means in my power.

The maintenance of our Union of States in all its integrity and completeness is, to my mind, the nation's pearl of great price, that can never be abandoned while there are life and power to preserve and defend it.

The grand question that now claims the united wisdom of the statesman, philosopher, and patriot, is how best to preserve and render more perfect this Union with the least possible expense of life and treasure.

The true statesman will always regulate his acts by the requirements of truth and justice. He will endeavor to keep in view the causes that produce the blessings we enjoy, and the evils we encounter.

To do this, he will gather wisdom by studying the course of human events, where pride and selfishness have strewed the course of time with all the wrecks and wretchedness whose frightful monuments still stand like beacon-lights in the pathway of nations, to warn us to beware lest a worse fate befall us. The experience of seventy years has taught me to believe that the evils brought on us by the folly and rashness of our Southern neighbors have resulted from the different circumstances of climate, birth, education, and the peculiar institutions with which they have been surrounded. So that if we had been born in exactly their circumstances and condition, we should have been as they; and if they had been born to all the circumstances and conditions that have surrounded us, they would have been as we—showing that it is the almost omnipotent power of circumstances that has made us to differ in our opinions, feelings, and interests—God having made us to differ not only in color, but in habits, capacity, and fitness for different countries, climates, and pursuits. It is the knowledge and application of this fact to life, that render obedience to the requirements of Christian charity possible, and cause it to be the greatest of all virtues, for the very reason that the exercise of charity is so constantly required to enable us to bear with the weakness and imperfections of each other.

It is a fact that the enslavement of human beings has so far infused its insidious poison into the very hearts of the Southern people, that they have come to believe and declare the evil of slavery to be a good, and to require the power of Government to be exerted to maintain, extend, and perpetuate an institution that enables thousands to sell their own children, to be enslaved, with all their posterity, into hopeless bondage.

It is terrible to know that the South is now waging war to strengthen this unnatural system. They demand for it stronger guarantees, additional protection; and some even demand the right to reopen the trade and importation of African slaves. This course on the part of the South, has compelled the people of the North to use the power of the nation to preserve, in all its integrity, the Constitution, and those laws made in compliance with it—laws which are quite as important for the South as the North, and absolutely necessary to avoid future wars, and

to secure peace and prosperity for all the States. This war has forced on the nation's government the duty to use the most effectual means possible to exterminate the vile heresy of secession, in order to restore the supremacy of the Constitution and the laws.

During the sessions of the last and preceding Congress, I ventured to recommend to Hon. John Sherman and other Republican members, that they should declare their intentions by some decided action calculated to force conviction on the Southern mind that the Republican party intended to secure to the South every equitable right which they could claim by virtue of any and all the obligations of the Constitution. I am fully of the opinion that the proposition of Mr. Adams to erect New Mexico into a State, and to repeal the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, should have been adopted, placing that measure of peace on its original foundation.

Such a course would have left the South without the shadow of excuse for the course that they have adopted. Such a policy would have strengthened the Union sentiment throughout the South to a degree that would have secured the Border States to the Union, and rendered it impossible for their desperate leaders to have made headway against them.

The question that now required to be decided is, to adopt the plan best calculated to restore peace and prosperity to the nation.

It is now to be decided whether respect and obedience to the laws will more surely result from a continued manifestation of our determination to perform every obligation of the Constitution in a kind and liberal spirit, rather than rely entirely upon a display and application of force.

The evidence should be constantly kept before the people, showing that every use and application of force will be resorted to—not willingly, but of necessity—for our good as a nation, to secure the invaluable treasure bequeathed to us in trust for ourselves, our posterity, and the world.

In order that we of the North may perform our duty wisely and well, we cannot too often refer to the circumstances that attended the formation of the Constitution under which we live.

It had required the power and force of all the States united

to gain their independence of the mother country. To preserve that independence, it became absolutely necessary for the separate sovereign and independent States to yield up such specified portions of the sovereign power they possessed as would form a complete and perfect union in a constitutional government combining the strength and power of all the States, to be used to maintain the perfect union and government they had formed, for the purpose of facilitating commerce, and securing full protection to all the rights they had reserved.

In the original formation of that Constitution, it became absolutely necessary to make a compromise with that great and all-pervading interest which had then already entered into the very life-blood of the nation, rendering the formation of an union of States hopeless without such a compromise as would secure the return of that species of property held bound to labor to their owners. It should be borne in mind that we of the North did enter into a contract and agreement with that great interest, by which we (of the North) did secure a most valuable equivalent—one vitally important to regulate the commerce of a nation, and preserve internal peace and harmony for the whole country. These were advantages that were only possible to such an union of States as would combine the strength of all for the preservation and security of each individual and every State.

It is well for us to remember that the inheritance of slavery was forced on our fathers by the unyielding policy of the mother country; that it has grown into such a vast and formidable interest as to place it beyond the reach of all sudden and violent means or remedies. In the opinion of Silas Wright, it had become to the framers of the Constitution perfectly apparent that the very idea of a republican confederation of States must be abandoned, or this seeming difficulty must be encountered of organizing a free republican government with the existence of slavery in the States.

He then asks if such men as formed the Constitution could doubt what was their duty, and what choice they should make, when the existence of slavery was not to be affected any further than to secure an end to the inhuman practice of importing slaves.

Mr. Wright says the question was then to be settled whether we should tolerate domestic slavery, or continue the white race in endless subjection by entirely abandoning all efforts to organize a free republic, thereby making themselves the enduring objects of oppression, without securing any prospect of deliverance to the colored race.

And all this suffering to determine whether the black man shall earn his bread in this State or that one; whether he shall obey a master bound by law and interest to provide for his wants, or whether he shall be mastered by circumstances that Mr. Jefferson declared will promptly extinguish his race, by the sufferings to which they must inevitably be subjected by living with a race with whom amalgamation would be a cruelty, to which Thomas Jefferson says no lover of his kind or country can innocently consent.

It is much to be regretted that the several States could not have been persuaded to abolish all laws which irritated the South, while doing nothing to alleviate the condition of slaves.

The several States should have been urged by every influence that Government could exert, to so amend their laws as to remove every appearance of bad faith as to a conformity with the requirements of the Constitution.

It is clearly the duty of all the free States to yield up fugitives from labor on demand, as our part of the obligations of the Constitution. This has been done in nearly all cases throughout the free States, notwithstanding the system of slavery is opposed to all the best feelings of our nature, and against the spirit and progress of the age.

The constitutional requirement to return fugitive slaves on their being demanded by Southern men, having been acknowledged and performed by the States, has been reaffirmed by an almost unanimous vote in Congress, with a request to the several States not only to repeal their personal liberty bills, but also to pass such an amendment to the Constitution as would put it out of the power of the North to interfere with the institutions of the South.

These honest efforts on the part of the North to maintain peace and friendship were met by a relentless war, waged for

the destruction of the Constitution and the dissolution of the Union.

This act of causeless war, committed by States now in open rebellion, has relieved our country and Government from all obligations to uphold or defend an institution so at war with natural justice and all the dearest rights of a common humanity.

The National Government is required, by the obligations of the Constitution, to execute the laws in such a manner as will most effectually promote the general welfare, establish justice, and secure domestic tranquillity, with the guarantee of a Republican form of Government to every State.

The faithful performance of this duty requires the Government to use all the means that God and nature has placed within our power to exterminate the heresy of secession, and thus remove a cause leading directly to anarchy and war.

To avoid such a calamity, we must preserve, maintain, and defend the Constitution and Union of States on the same principle that we would destroy a city to save a nation.

The strength, power, and progress of this rebellion make it necessary for the Government of our country to adopt the most certain and effectual means to bring this terrible war to an end.

It is now necessary to determine whether it is possible to overcome and hold an agricultural people, so great in number, occupying so large an extent of fertile country, while we allow their slave labor, on which they depend, to remain quiet and undisturbed in the production of the very means necessary to enable their rebellious Government to carry on a war for our destruction.

The continuance of this rebellion will soon satisfy every soldier and man of the North that the slave who cultivates the fields is as much a power to be met and overcome as the rebel armies that are now pointing the engines of death at the nation's liberties and life.

If I am not mistaken, the time has come when it is the duty of Congress to invoke every constitutional power of the Government to quell this rebellion, and throw the expenses of this war on the persons and property of all those found in arms against the Government, the Constitution, and the laws.

In order to show our determination to secure to the South all their rights, it should be proclaimed, in all kindness, from the highest authority of the nation, that the people of the north have no desire for conquest, and no thought of subjugation beyond what is made absolutely necessary to save our nation from being broken up and ruined by a combination of interested and designing men, whose business it has been to mislead and deceive their people.

This combination, formed as it is of ambitious men, by false representations has prevailed on their people to believe that we of the north were determined to make war on their institutions, in open violation of all the requirements of the Constitution.

So far from this being true, there was not one in a hundred of the people of the North who would, if they could, have interfered with the rights intended to be secured by the obligations of the Constitution. They were, as a body, determined to perform their part of the contract for the equivalent they had received, until fully absolved from an agreement that could only have been entered into and excused by the force of circumstances entirely beyond their control.

The time has now come when Southern men must know that the Union must be preserved, and it is for them to determine whether they will persevere in their rebellion until the North shall be compelled, in the most reluctant self defence, to render contraband of war the slaves and property of all persons found in arms against the laws and Government of the country.

It should be remembered by all, that slavery is in itself a perpetual war in its natural struggles for freedom, and that this struggle can never cease until men by nature choose slavery in preference to freedom, and until men actually prefer being forced, instead of performing free compensated labor.

The poet declared an unalterable truth when he said:

> " Man must soar;
> An obstinate activity within,
> An unsuppressive spring will toss him up,
> In spite of fortune's load. Not kings alone—
> Each villager has his ambition, too.
> No sultan prouder than his fettered slave.
> Slaves build their little Babylons of straw,
> Echo the proud Assyrian in their hearts,

> And cry, 'Behold the wonders of my might.'
> And why? Because immortal as their Lord;
> And souls immortal must forever heave
> At something great."

During all the past, when slavery was regarded as an evil entailed on the country by a power over which they had no control, it did not corrupt the heart of the people as it now does when a controlling power in the South has determined to make their system of slavery the very corner stone of the American nation. This greatest of all national evils must not, cannot be allowed, while there is a power possible to maintain our Union of States—a Union that has given us seventy years of peace at home, with honor and respect throughout the world. The advice of Napoleon to a young American, is appropriate to the present condition of our country. He said: "Cultivate union, or your empire will be like a colossus of gold—of gold fallen to the earth, broken in pieces, and a prey to foreign and domestic Saracens."

With profound and sincere respect,

I subscribe myself,

Your friend,

PETER COOPER.

☞ *Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No. 863 Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.*

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 24.

PATRIOTISM,

A CHRISTIAN VIRTUE.

A SERMON PREACHED BY THE REV. JOSEPH FRANSIOLI, AT ST. PETER'S (CATHOLIC) CHURCH, BROOKLYN, JULY 26TH, 1863.

"When Jesus drew near Jerusalem, seeing the City, he wept over it."—*Luke.*

These words of the Gospel of this Sunday bring to our contemplation a fact, that is wonderfully significant in the present circumstances of our country. The Gospel has recorded only two instances in which our Holy Redeemer shed tears,—once at the tomb of Lazarus, his friend, and once at the sight of Jerusalem, the capital of his country.

Neither the persecutions of the magistrates, the calumnies of the Scribes and Pharisees, the ingratitude of the people, the insults and tortures of the soldiers—not even the denial of Peter or the treason of Judas, ever caused a single tear to drop from the merciful eyes of Jesus.

But when the body of his friend appears decaying in the grave, and the future irreparable destruction of his motherland is brought to his mind in sight of the capital of that unfortunate country, then his tender affection, overpowered so to speak, moves him to weep. What a lesson for us is contained in this extraordinary event! Christ weeps over Jerusalem, because, in

time to come, the magnificent city shall be levelled to the ground, and with it the whole country destroyed, and the whole nation swept from the surface of the earth. He weeps because he loves his country; he weeps because his countrymen do not withstand the criminal cause of the impending disaster. Hence patriotism is not only a social virtue, commanding respect, but a *christian virtue*, to be rewarded by the blessings of God here and hereafter. On this noble subject I will speak to you, proposing two points:

1st. To love our country is our duty as men and Christians.

2d. How must we show our love towards our country?

1st. Man is naturally so born for society that he could not exist, grow and prosper alone. His first society is the family. Private families are the members of the great human family. The immense human family is subdivided by geographical positions and conventional arrangements into several families or societies, called nations; all nations are governed by certain fundamental laws and additional regulations, directed to protect all the members in their property and their lives, and to promote their welfare. All men born in, or by their own choice belonging to a nation, and enjoying under the laws of the land the blessings of all kinds emanating from them, are citizens or children of the national family or motherland. The duty of loving her stands on the same principle as the duty of a member of loving his family, and of a child of loving its mother. In fact, our motherland, the place of our birth or of our adoption, with an affection that we hardly appreciate, opening her maternal bosom, feeds us in our hunger, refreshes us in our thirst, clothes us, and takes all cares of our welfare. Hence the duty of loving her imposed upon us by nature is loudly proclaimed by the history of mankind. There, shame is recorded for cowards, traitors and tyrants; there, honors and benedictions are poured out over the faithful and generous lover of his country. Visit all nations, whether barbarous or civilized, travel all over the earth, and everywhere you shall meet traditions and inscriptions immortalizing patriotic deeds, and monuments erected to true patriots, by the instinctive gratitude of the nations to per-

petuate to posterity the memory of those noble citizens, as well as to enkindle in the hearts of all, love to their country. Deny the duty of loving your country, and you deny your own feelings; you deny mankind itself. Deny the duty of loving your country, and, I say it emphatically, you reap contempt and execration.

2d. But, if to love our country is a duty, it is also a virtue; for virtue is nothing else than the performance of our duties, and the value of any virtue is measured by the degree of punctuality and purity shown in fulfilling our duties.

This duty of loving our country, which nature and society impose upon us, is more strictly enforced by Christian Catholic religion. As Christian Catholics, we are followers of Christ. He came on earth Reformer and Redeemer, not to dissolve the national and social duties, but to encourage and help us to their more perfect fulfillment. A Catholic that loves not his country does not understand his religion.

Take the Holy Scriptures, which is the book of Christianity and Catholicity; look from beginning to end over those pages, and see that no one is celebrated there as a saint or a great man who was not at once faithful to his God and ever affectionate to his country. What were the Patriarchs but the founders of the Jewish nationality? Who was Moses? The great legislator and patriot, who, with an excess of confidence in his God, could say to Him: "Or suspend Thy punishment against my people, or blot me out of the book of life." All the Judges who followed Moses, like Joshua, Gideon, Samuel, were they not all distinguished patriots? Who, among the kings, ranks greater and more glorious than those who spent their lives for the benefit of their people, and, of the stock of David, the most popular and valiant of all the Hebrew monarchs, Jesus Christ was born in the fullness of time. This great Redeemer of mankind was expected as the Redeemer of his nation, to which he paid the tribute, and was so faithful, so liberal, and so affectionate, that to-day he is represented weeping for the disasters impending over it. The apostles, the zealous missionaries of Christ, commenced their labors in their native country. There, first, they developed their power, their charity, their heroism. Tell me

whether, among the holy Fathers who are the representatives of the golden times of Christianity, you can find one who was not a patriot? Read the ecclesiastical history, and from Ambrose —that refuses entrance into the temple to Theodosious, guilty of the blood of his people—down to the humble friar Anthony of Padova, who rebuked the cruelties of Ezelino, the tyrant of Lombardy, you shall not find one saint that was not, at the same time, a patriot. You find here and there patriots who were not, and are not, saints, but you shall seek in vain for a Catholic saint that was not a patriot.

Do you know the great change effected by Christian religion in connection with nationalities? The abolition of the principle of sacrificing the nation to the individual, and the establishment of the stupendous system of sacrificing the individualities to the nation. Hence, according to the spirit of Catholicity, we must love our neighbors as ourselves, our family more than our neighbor, our country more than our family, and our God alone more than our country. Hence, our Saviour, who was a Galilean born in Bethlehem, and residing in Nazareth, in foreseeing the disasters of his country, wept not in sight of Bethlehem or approaching Nazareth, but when he drew near Jerusalem, the capital of his country, he wept then and there. Hence, the national rights and integrity must be dearer to the Christian patriot than any other individual right; consequently must sound extremely painful to the ears of a patriot the theories of certain citizens, who favor the intervention of foreign powers in our national affairs, and deny to the national authorities all interference in the affairs of the States of the nation.

In accordance with the principles above stated, the duty of loving our country becomes more sacred and expansive in proportion to the blessings that one enjoys from his motherland. A country whose institutions provide equally for the welfare of all classes; where the laws are enacted by the majority of the people, to suit the general interest; where opportunities are offered to all citizens to develop their abilities, to apply their mental and physical powers, and raise themselves to a high respectability; where the land is redundant with all kinds of products, and offers inexhaustible resources of wealth and grandeur; a country of such description, and offering such advantages

to all, without distinction of birth or class, such a country must naturally command the most tender affection. Now, if we apply these theories to our own case, how dearly should we, American citizens, love this wonderful country, the greatest, the richest on earth, the glorious shelter of mankind. And, indeed, individually I know thousands who love this country most affectionately, but, collectively taken, the people do not love the country as they should. O may they love her as much as she deserves!

How must we show our love towards our country? The answer to this question embraces the second point proposed for your consideration, and I answer:

1st. By loving the institutions of our country. Hence we must study them, to understand and appreciate them as the most wonderful conception and work of political wisdom. Then we must support them, and, with all means in our power, we must try to extend their beneficent influences. Forget not, that these institutions lose not only their beautiful architype of symmetry and harmony, but even their efficiency of action if secondary interests are allowed to prevail over the general interest of the American Union. Forget not, that such institutions are the creation and voluntary choice of the people, and that the people must stand by them with inexorable respect and indomitable tenacity. When a building of classical architecture is threatened with ruin by accidents or age, the efforts of the architect superintending the work of reconstruction are concentrated to preserve the general character and design. Bear in mind forever the comparison.

2d. By respecting and loving one another, without any regard to difference of religious creed or political opinion. Prejudices must be removed; we are all brothers, all children of the same mother.

To say that Puritans, or Catholics, cannot be good patriots, is a deplorable error, contradicted on our side by centuries of glorious patriots all over the earth, and in this country refuted by streams of blood and numberless lives sacrificed to the Union on the fields of battles by heroic Catholic patriotism.

Let us only be just and tolerant, and we shall not have reason to blame one another, but reasons to forgive one another.

If there are wicked and foolish among us, we do not endorse them, because our religion teaches us to be good and wise Christians, good and wise citizens. If we should appeal to the innocent to throw the first stone against the guilty one, who would dare to strike the first blow?

3d. We must love our country by obeying the laws of our country and standing by the authorities or Government, not as a party, but as a principle. Except in case that the laws of the country and the orders of the lawful authorities were in opposition to the laws of God, we are always bound to obey; Christ obeyed the laws of his country, paid the tribute, and gave command to render Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and yet the Cæsars of his time were not the choice of the people, but imposed and forced upon the people. How much more must we respect the authorities of our country, which in a legal manner, by the vote of the people, are constituted?

The apostles obeyed the laws of the country, wherever they were, not conflicting with their own Divine mission.

St. Paul, as a Roman citizen, appealed to the Roman law and tribunal. And when the primitive Christians were accused by the Romans as a dangerous set of people, inimical to the country, because they constantly refused to obey the orders of sacrificing to the pagan deities, St. Paul came forward to refute the accusation and to establish the Christian doctrine upon the important subject. Take the XIII. chapter of his epistle to the Romans: "Let every soul to be subject to higher powers; for "there is no power but from God, and that those that are, are "ordained of God; therefore he that resisteth the power resist-"eth the ordinance of God, and they that resist purchase to "themselves damnation. For princes (the authorities) are not a "terror to the good work, but to the evil. Will thou then not "be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou "shalt have praise from the same: for he is God's minister to "thee for good, wherefore be subject of necessity not only for "wrath, but also for conscience sake."

But I have heard citizens object to this doctrine of the apostle by saying that, when the law is unjust and unconstitutional and

the administration corrupt there then arises the right of revolution admitted by all statesmen. I answer. If the law is unjust, in the sense that it interferes with your duties of a higher sphere, that is to say your duties towards God and your conscience, then the martyrs of Christendom teach you how to deal with it, lay down your life in confirmation of your faith, without any violent resistance. When the Emperor Maxamilian ordered his army in crossing the Alps to sacrifice to the idols; six thousand and six hundred christian soldiers left their ranks, declaring it to be sacriligious for them to adore false deities. They retired from the rest of the army. To this declaration, the answer of the emperor was an order to a large detachment of the army to decimate the disobedient soldiers. Upon hearing such an atrocious command, the noble soldiers of the Theban Legion led by their Chieftain Morrisa, who fought always bravely against the enemies of the country, as to deserve the name of the legion of heroes, laid down their arms, and offered their heads, and one after the other all were barbarously executed, but gave no resistance, although with the arms in their hands, and with their union and valor, they could easily have defended their right.

If the law is unjust, in the sense that it is against the constitution, you have the legal means to obtain redress to your grievances. Never any right of revolution can be sanctioned, but in case that all the legal means were exhausted in vain, and that the oppression lasted so long, and was so politically murderous as to cause desolation and despair. Revolution was never supported even by European statesmen, but for the purpose of shaking off foreign tyrannical dominion to reconstruct dismembered nationalities, never to destroy them. A revolution to destroy the motherland, or the nation, is an atrocious absurdity—a parricide.

Finally, we must love our country by supporting her existence, and promoting her welfare with all means in our power. In prosperous times let us enjoy peacefully and thankfully her blessings, and in times of trouble and danger, let us rush to her rescue.

The true Christian patriot brings before the altar of his country, his property and his life cheerfully ready for the sacrifice when it is demanded. What kind of friends are those

who love their friends only in time of prosperity, and abandon them in time of adversity? What kind of children are those who love their parents and relatives only, when peace, health and plenty cheer the house, and desert it in time of sickness and affliction? Does not the noble mother love more her child when it is ill and poor? Does not the good son feel more attachment to his parents when suffering and dying? Does not the doctrine and examples of Christ teach us that he loved the sufferers and wept over the impending disasters of his country? If the coming destruction of a country is worth the tears of Jesus, what shall the troubles, the dangers of our own country demand from us? Here I conclude my discourse, and say to you my dearly-beloved friends: these are times of trials, of dangers, of self-denial. Instead of losing our time in merciless criticism, in querulous complaint, in criminal insinuation of resistance to the authorities lawfully constituted, let us study the book of our own troubles with tears in our eyes, with wisdom in our mind, with fortitude in our hearts.

Let us learn the lesson of the tears of Christ, for fear that one day to come he should reproach us with having not *known the time of our visitation.*

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 25.

THE

CONDITIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION;

IN A LETTER FROM

ROBERT DALE OWEN

TO THE

SECRETARY OF STATE.

LETTER

FROM

HON. S. P. CHASE, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,

TO THE

LOYAL NATIONAL LEAGUE.

NEW YORK:
WM. C. BRYANT & CO., PRINTERS, 41 NASSAU ST., COR. LIBERTY.

1863.

THE VACANT CHAIRS IN CONGRESS.

To the Honorable WILLIAM H. SEWARD,
Secretary of State:

SIR: You have reminded us that peace must come some time, and that conferences, in some shape, must precede or attend it. We do well to bear this in mind, and to inspect, beforehand, the ground which we shall by-and-by be called upon to tread. There must, at last, be certain conditions of peace.

You have intimated your preference for the Halls of Congress (the vacant seats once more filled) as the constitutional forum best suited for conferences of pacification.

The vacant seats once more filled! That is desirable, no doubt—under certain conditions; and of all the preliminaries of peace, none are so important as these. The men who shall fill those vacant seats will hold in their hands the balance of legislative power.

Who are constitutionally entitled to fill them?

The Supreme Court has decided, by a unanimous vote, that since the passage of a law (sometimes called the "Non-Intercourse law"), approved July 13, 1861, the inhabitants of the insurrectionary portions of the Union are public enemies; not the disloyal alone, not those who have taken up arms alone, but *all*. After stating that the territory "held in hostility to the United States has a defined boundary,"* the Court adds:

---

* This boundary, earlier defined by the respective acts of Secession, was officially declared by proclamation of the President, issued under date of July 1, 1862. This was done in accordance with a requisition contained in the second section of an act of Congress, approved June 7, 1862. The list includes eleven States,

"All persons residing within this Territory, whose property may be used to increase the revenues of the hostile power, are, in this contest, liable to be treated as enemies, though not foreigners." * * * "When the regular course of justice is interrupted by Rebellion or Insurrection, so that the courts of justice cannot be kept open, civil war exists; and hostilities may be prosecuted *on the same footing as if those opposing the Government were foreign enemies invading the land.*" * * * "Whether property be liable to capture as enemies' property, does not, in any manner, depend upon the personal allegiance of the owner."*

The decision of our highest legal tribunal is, that these men, without distinction as to individual loyalty or disloyalty, have, in law, the same rights, and the same rights only, as alien enemies invading the United States. Men cannot by their own act, release themselves from constitutional obligations; but they can and they do, by levying war against the Government, forfeit their constitutional rights.

For war annuls all treaties, all conventions, all agreements how solemn soever, securing privileges or protection to a hostile party. The rights of war alone remain. By civil war, the insurrectionists lose every privilege, every protection, which the Constitution affords to the citizen. We act upon this principle every day. By the Constitution, the home and the effects of the citizen are inviolate except after warrant issued, upon probable cause and under oath, specially describing the premises. Does this apply to the house of a Rebel in an insurrectionary State? The Constitution declares that the citizen shall not be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law. What process of law precedes the opening of a battery on the Confederate ranks? or the confinement of our prisoners of war? or the appropriation of the enemy's ammunition or commissary stores?

---

reckoning Eastern Virginia as one. It does not include Western Virginia, nor Maryland, nor Kentucky, nor Missouri. Nothing here said, therefore, applies to the constitutional rights of the inhabitants of any of these States. To a proper understanding, of the legal points involved, it is indispensable to bear in mind which States are, in the eye of the law, insurrectionary and which are not.

* "*Claimants of Schooners Brilliant, &c., versus United States.*" March term, 1863. Opinion by Grier, J. Amer. Law Register, April, 1863, pp. 334 to 344.

When we make and ratify with a foreign nation, in time of peace, a treaty granting to the subjects of that nation certain rights and immunities, that treaty becomes part and parcel of the supreme law of the land—as much so as the Constitution itself. But when that nation declares war, its subjects can no more claim one of these solemnly granted rights and immunities than if the treaty had never existed. No single rule of international law is better established than this.

But under that very rule the insurgents, having levied war, and having thus become public enemies, can no more claim any of the privileges or immunities once guaranteed to them under the Constitution than an alien enemy can claim rights under a treaty ratified during peace, but canceled on the day his Government declared war.

Therefore, by a rule of public law, applicable in all wars, and sanctioned by the assent and the constant usage of every civilized nation, no inhabitant of the insurrectionary territory has a constitutional right to elect a member to the Congress of the United States; and no Senator or Representative elected by the insurrectionists, though according to the forms prescribed by the Constitution, can legally fill a single vacant seat in our Congressional Halls.

Nor is the legal aspect of the case one whit changed, if these men lay down their arms. A treaty made during peace and canceled by war, does not revive with the cessation of hostilities. The matter is then as completely open to negotiation as if no treaty had ever been made. A treaty in the same words, or with entirely different conditions, may be made; but it is a new treaty, and whether it shall be made, or shall not be made, is a matter entirely at the option of the contracting parties.

Any rule of law in contravention of this would be an absurdity too flagrant even to merit discussion. Does the insurgent who appeals to the wager of battle risk nothing? Is he to be secure and successful, whatever betide? If he conquer, is everything to be under his control? And if he be vanquished, is he still to retain each right and privilege which he ever possessed? Who, under such a state of things, so safe and prosperous as a Rebel?

In virtue, then, of one of the plainest and best established rules

of international law, the inhabitants of the insurgent States, whether in arms or after submission, have no constitutional right whatever to add, by election, one member to the Congress of the United States.

This is the law. Our right to enforce it is as undeniable as our right, with an army, to cross the Potomac.

But all things which are lawful to us are not expedient. There may be legal rights which it is unprofitable, or unmerciful, to enforce. We have the right, if good it seem to us, to restore to the South, with or without conditions, her constitutional privileges; just as we had the right, at the close of the last war with Great Britain, to revive and ratify anew the treaty of amity and commerce which existed before that war began.

In making up our decision as to this matter we should not suffer ourselves to be moved by bitterness, or anger, or rankling animosity. The Christian is bidden to forgive trespasses against himself, even to seventy times seven. The statesman, if he merit the name, is actuated, not by passionate impulse, but by a grave and considerate regard for great national interests; above all, for the establishment, on an enduring foundation, of that domestic tranquillity which lies at the basis of all national good. And the enlightened statesman knows, and founds his public acts upon the knowledge, that, as between litigant individuals so between opposing communities of men, no bargain can properly be called good, that is not permanently beneficial to both the contending parties.

But if there be danger at such a crisis from the intemperance and the injustice of sectional hate, there is greater danger from the temporizing weakness of ruinous concession. It has been said by one of the wisest of modern writers on public affairs, that "when a nation has been wearied by long strife, it will submit to be duped for the sake of peace." * Let us heed that warning voice. Otherwise, all victories may be barren.

Every publicist of repute has set forth (what common sense suggests), as among the most important of national rights and duties, the rule that a nation ought to protect itself not only

---

* De Tocqueville's "*Ancien Régime et la Révolution.*" Chap. XIII.

against immediate but also against prospective dangers. Deriving all rights attendant on conquest "from justifiable self-defence," Vattel says:

"When the conqueror has subdued a hostile nation, he may, if prudence so require, *render her incapable of doing mischief with the same ease in future.*" * * * If the safety of the State lies at stake, our precaution and foresight cannot be extended too far."*

In closing, by a peace, this war commenced by the South, what precautions should be taken to prevent a second insurrection? What does prudence require to be done, that the South may be rendered "incapable of doing mischief with the same ease in future?"

As soon as the enemy lays down his arms, shall we admit him, without conditions, to our Congressional councils, give him a vote in framing our laws, see him ally himself with every disaffected member from the North, suffer him, with their aid, to override the entire legislation of the last two years, permit him to disarm us by voting down all military and naval appropriations, instal him as judge in his own case, and sit quietly by while he rescinds the Emancipation Proclamation, repeals the Confiscation act, repays himself for all slaves lost during the insurrection, perhaps repudiates the National debt, or—if, to carry the last measure, a few votes should be lacking—compromises the matter by adding to the debt incurred for the preservation of public order, the twelve or fifteen hundred millions spent in a fruitless attempt to overthrow it? Shall we adopt this as our policy? If we do, it will be the first time so stupendous a piece of national folly was ever enacted since the world began.

The extent of that folly and its practical consequences will be better appreciated by glancing at a few figures. If all the vacant seats in the next Congress are suffered to be filled without conditions, there will be, under the new census, in the House, 85 Slave State votes to 156 Free State votes; and in the

---

* Vattel's "*Law of Nations.*" Book III., § 201 and § 44.

Senate 30 Slave State votes to 38 Free State votes. Thirty six Northern votes siding with the South in the House, and five Northern votes siding with her in the Senate, would give her a majority in both branches. The command of the Senate alone, by aid of five Northern votes, would enable the South to arrest all legislation; to deny, for example, all supplies, whether for civil or military purposes.

I desire, as you do, to see the vacant chairs in Congress filled. I desire to see them filled, as you have expressed it, by those "who may be constitutionally sent there." I desire, at the earliest moment consistent with the public safety, to see revived, in favor of the people of the South, those constitutional privileges which they legally forfeited by levying war against their and our Government. But I call to mind Vattel's wise suggestion and De Tocqueville's sage warning. I am unwilling to see the nation "duped for the sake of peace." I am unwilling to admit to our councils insurgents by whose act the land has been deluged with blood, until they shall have been rendered "incapable of doing mischief with the same ease in future." For the very sake of peace, I am unwilling to assent to a peace which will be the prolific parent of future wars.

Few among us really desire so hollow a peace. If we sift the matter to the bottom, the diversity of opinion as to our future policy is, in one sense, much less radical than on the surface it appears. If men differ as to the conditions under which the insurgents shall be restored to their forfeited rights, it is not, as a general rule, because any man desires war in perpetuity. All but the grossly ignorant know that war, protracted through long years, or perpetually recurring, involves ruin to all interests, public and private, political and commercial. Most men strongly feel that our country, desolated and demoralized by a fifteen or twenty years' civil war, would not be worth living in.

If it seem to us incredible that men free from insanity and having the public ear,* should express their willingness

---

* In a leader of The New York Daily *Herald* of August 12, the editor, after predicting that the next Congress will repudiate the Emancipation Proclamation and the Confiscation Act, adverts, but without quoting it, to your letter of February 6, 1863, to Mr. Dayton—which he calls a letter to M. Mercier—in these terms:

that Davis and Stephens, that Mason and Slidell, that Floyd and Cobb and Breckenridge, that Wise, Hunter, Toombs, Pickens, Rhett, Benjamin, and all the other Secession leaders, to whose treason we owe that gigantic conspiracy which has cost hundreds of thousand of lives, and hundreds of millions of treasure—that these men and their accomplices in crime (if only the South sees fit to elect them, and if only they, in presenting themselves, take that customary oath, which once already they have violated) should become again legislators for our country, and should be deemed, in conjunction with their sympathizing allies of the North, the proper agents to decide, by their votes, the terms of pacification—if all this seem to us incredible, let us not rashly conclude that the advocates of a scheme so monstrous entertain the deliberate design to give our country over, for a generation to come, to rapine and anarchy. They are but the blind leading the blind. They cherish the delusion that this Republic may be reconstructed part free, part slave, and yet remain, in permanence, at peace. But for that delusion, none but outlaws, or men disposed, like burglars at a fire, to enrich themselves at expense of their neighbors' ruin, would entertain, for a moment, the project of a reconstruction on such conditions: for it is not, except of an insignificant minority, the *intention* to perpetuate war.

Reconstruction of the Republic, part free, part slave! This is a Northern delusion, not a Southern doctrine. The Southern leaders are too clear-sighted to believe in it, and too honest to pretend that they do. They know and declare, if some of their friends here do not, what caused the present insurrection. One of the most intelligent among them, selected as their Vice-

---

"Meantime, we call on Mr. Seward to make good the pledge he gave in his letter to the French Minister, M. Mercier, to receive back into the Union the Southern States as they are, with all their institutions intact, and to admit into Congress such of their Senators as survive, who were entitled to seats when the Rebellion broke out, and such other Senators as those States may think proper to send to fill up vacancies, together with whatever representatives they may elect according to the Constitution and laws."

I pray that you will not imagine I so misconceive your language as to put upon it such a construction as that.

President, Alexander H. Stephens, speaking for them before a vast audience at Savannah, a few days after his election, publicly said:

"Negro slavery was the immediate cause of the late rupture and present revolution. Jefferson, in his forecast, had anticipated this, as the rock upon which the old Union would split."

Adverting, in the same address, to slavery as having been regarded by the leading revolutionary statesmen to be "wrong in principle, socially, morally and politically," he adds: "This stone, which was rejected by the first builders, is become the chief stone of the corner in our new edifice."

Additions to the new edifice he tolerates, on certain conditions. Speaking of "accessions from the States of the old Union," he says they can be received "upon no such principle of *reconstruction* as is now spoken of, but upon *reorganization* and new assimilation." And lest this should not sufficiently explain his idea, in alluding to the probability that the "great States of the Northwest shall gravitate this way," he declares: "Our doors are wide enough to receive them, *but not until they are ready to assimilate with us in principle.*"

The terms are plain enough. Southern politicians recognize what you recognized long ago—the irrepressible conflict between the Slave labor system of the South and the Free labor system of the North. They perceive what you perceived, that a nation ultimately to avoid civil war, must be all free or all slave. They will permit no additions to the Confederacy except on the basis of its corner stone—negro Slavery. They will receive no accessions of States that do not assimilate their institutions to those of the new edifice. States desiring to join them shall come in admitting Slavery, or not at all. Such States must agree to Chief Justice Taney's opinion, that there is "no difference between property in a slave and other property;" therefore, that the owner of a slave has a right to take him where he pleases, and a right to his service and labor for life, no matter where that life may be spent. Thus assimilated in principle to the Confederacy, other States are deemed worthy to join it. Without such assimilation they are to be rejected; prudently and properly rejected, by slaveholders who are de-

termined to remain such; for an attempt to reconcile the irreconcilable can produce only strifes and heart-burnings—inevitably eventuating, as we have seen them eventuate, in civil war.

Wise are these men in their generation! Statesmen are they, in running out their conclusions, if only custom and tradition had not deluded them into one foundation-principle, monstrously false. Frank, too, and bold do they show themselves, in announcing that principle. No paltry temporizing! no tame apologies! "Slavery," they declare, "is the natural and moral condition of the negro. This our new government is the first in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical and moral truth." *

Concede this, the postulate of their system, and all the rest is strictly logical.

Concede but this, and South Carolina's Declaration of Independence † is a document stamped with forecast, and entitled to commendation. Whoever drafted it ran out his premises to their logical results. The convention that adopted it saw their way before them, and did not, like their weak sympathizers in the North, expect incompatibilities.

Having set up their "great philosophical trnth," the cornerstone of their political system, they saw clearly that they must insure it respect; that they must protect it from attack or condemnation; and they perceived that this could not be done if they maintained fellowship with the North. "The non-Slaveholding States" they declare, "have denounced as sinful the institution of Slavery." This, from citizens of the same Republic, they cannot permit; nor, except by secession from the non-Slaveholding States, can they prevent it. "All hope of remedy"—thus their Declaration concludes—"all hope of remedy is rendered vain by the fact, that public opinion at the North has invested a great political error with the sanctions of a more erroneous religious belief."

---

* Address of Alexander H. Stephens, already quoted. See "*Putman's Rebellion Record.*" Vol. I, Documents, p. 45.

† "Declaration of Causes which induced the Secession of South Carolina," adopted Dec. 21, 1860. See "*Putnam's Rebellion Record,*" Vol. 1, Documents, pp. 3, 4.

Wise, in their generation, are South Carolina and the States that followed her lead! Building their system of Government upon a "great philosophical and moral truth," which (unfortunately they will say) the rest of the civilized world still regards as a flagrant moral falsehood, they can maintain the stability of their political edifice only by debarring all questions, all discussions that might assault and endanger its foundations. As in despotic monarchies it was found necessary to declare it to be treason punishable as a capital offense, to question the right divine of Kings, so in a slave empire they see it to be indispensable to forbid, on pain of death, all opinions touching the sinfulness, or inconsistency with religion, of Slavery. Twenty-five years ago they declared, from their places in Congress, that, in spite of the Federal Government, every Abolitionist they caught should die a felon's death.* It was no idle menace, as hundreds of murders for opinion's sake, committed in the South before the war, terribly attest.

Let us not blame the men, except it be for seeking to uphold the monstrous system handed down to them by their forefathers. They *must* resist the Federal authority to maintain that system. They *must* violate the constitutional provision which forbids to abridge "the liberty of speech or of the press:" self-defense and its necessities compel them. They found this necessary before the war, in order to save Slavery from destruction; the necessity will be increased, beyond measure, after its close. Now that the President's Proclamation of Emancipation has stirred up, in every Southern plantation, the latent longing for freedom, the dangers to their slave-system from propagandism will be increased a hundred fold.

It follows that in this Republic, if reconstructed half slave, half free, no man known to be opposed in principle to Slavery, will be able to cross Mason and Dixon's line, without imminent risk of life. South of that line the constitutional provision

---

* "Let an Abolitionist come within the borders of South Carolina, if we can catch him, we will try him, and notwithstanding all the interference of all the Governments on earth, including the Federal Government, we will hang him."—*Senator Preston, in debate in U. S. Senate,* January, 1838.

"If chance throw an Abolitionist in our way, he may expect a felon's death."—*Senator Hammond of South Carolina, in U. S. Senate,* 1836.

touching the liberty of speech and of the press will remain inoperative. A felon's death will await every resident or traveler in the South who prints or who utters, in public or in private, any denial that Slavery is just and moral, any assertion that religion does not sanction it. The Constitution guarantees the right thus to print, thus to speak. The Federal Government is bound to maintain that constitutional right. But it *cannot* maintain it in a Republic half slave, half free. What then? Can a free government sustain itself—can a free nation continue to exist—under such a state of things as that? Certainly not.

The South, seeing this, declared all hope of remedy to be vain. Her friends in the North, groping after reconstruction with Slavery, are still stricken with judicial blindness.

Let us pass to another matter. In South Carolina's "Declaration of Causes" for Secession, one of the chief (set forth as justifying and necessitating separation), is "the election of a man to the high office of President of the United States whose opinions and purposes are hostile to Slavery." This, it is declared, the Slaveholding States cannot permit, because, whenever it shall occur, "the Federal Government will have become their enemy." *

To satisfy the South so that she shall permit us again to unite with her, it is evident that we must do one of two things: either consent so to amend the Constitution that no man shall be eligible as President "whose opinions and purposes are hostile to slavery;" or else make up our minds to a second insurrection the first time a President, with such opinions, happens to be elected. The constitutional amendment, our first alternative, would be an infamy, if it were a possibility; the second alternative would be to accept peace on condition of abandoning forever freedom of election. The South does not so thoroughly despise us as to believe, for a moment, that we shall accept either.

But the very head and front of our former offending against the South, remains yet untouched on; the loose manner, namely, in which she alleges that the fugitive slave law has heretofore

---

* "Declaration of Causes," already quoted. "*Rebellion Record.*" Vol. 1, Documents, p. 4.

been enforced. This, our offense, was so grievous in the eyes of South Carolina, that she put it forth in her Declaration, as the first, and in itself the all-sufficient cause for separation; adding: "Thus the constitutional compact has been deliberately broken, and South Carolina is released from her obligation."*

What chance, even the remotest, is there that, with Slavery and Freedom in political partnership, this rock of offense will be avoided hereafter? Let us, for a moment, imagine that the Emancipation Proclamation has no force in law. Nevertheless, its glad tidings have penetrated to the remotest haunts of Southern Slavery. To the slave it is a reality. In his heart it has called up the assurance—the fervent hope, at least—that, if he can but once elude the vigilance of his master, there is yet freedom for him on this side of the grave. That hope once awakened throughout the length and breadth of the insurrectionary States, can it ever again be put to rest? Is it not certain that, under its promptings—no matter how firmly we shall have re-established Slavery by law—these bondmen will cross the border by thousands, for hundreds that have sought refuge among us till now? And when they do pass into that land whose President proclaimed them free men, and where twenty Abolitionists are to be found now, for every one that was there on the day Fort Sumter fell, will there be increased cheerfulness, greater willingness to aid in their rendition, than there was before the war began? What a mockery is the question! On what a foundation of quicksand do they build, who found their hopes of future peace on the expectation that a fugitive slave-law will be more stringently enforced in the future than in the past—on the vain dream that Northern spirit, flushed with victory, will find no occupation more noble than to pursue and secure poor fugitives, deluded by a national promise basely broken, and who had been urged to flight by belief in our humanity and confidence in our truth!

The South indulges in no such idle dream. She sees, and she accepts, the inevitable. Well she knows, and wisely she has declared, that, "All hope of remedy is rendered vain by the fact that public opinion at the North has invested (what she con-

---

* "*Rebellion Record*," Vol. I., Documents, p. 4.

siders) a great political error with the sanctions of a more erroneous religious belief."

Thus, then, it stands. The South, with eyes sharpened by self-interest, saw that an experiment which never had succeeded in the world before, was about to fail here also; the experiment of maintaining in perpetuity, side by side, under the same Government, two conflicting labor systems. She saw that her "philosophical truth" must be accepted as the corner-stone, or else altogether rejected by the builders. She saw that the North would *not* accept it. She saw that public opinion at the North would continue to condemn it as sinful and unchristian. She saw that the North would never consent to have freedom of speech and of the press suspended throughout half the republic. She saw that the pride of the North would never submit to the passage of a constitutional amendment, making Anti-Slavery opinions a disqualification for the Presidency. She saw that under any plan of reconstruction short of assimilation of labor systems, fugitive-slave law difficulties would increase, in number and bitterness, year and year.

She saw, in fine, that the path which for three-quarters of a century the North and South have been travelling together—of late, at every step, more and more beset with obstacles and dangers—had become wholly impracticable at last.

Between Slavery and National Unity was her only choice. She selected and emblazoned Slavery; drew the sword, and severed the political bonds which connected her with the Free States.

If she succeed in defeating us, she is entitled to her separate independence. If we prevail against her, shall we force her again to accompany us on that impracticable path which her forecast taught her to abandon?

Shall we tempt her again into fellowship by an offer to restore to her her constitutional rights, and a promise to maintain intact her system of slave-labor? Vanquished, exhausted, but with her convictions unchanged, she might agree to such an armistice. Permanent she knows well it could never be; but she knows also the vast advantage, in her present prostrate condition, of two or three years' breathing time. Shall we offer

her an opportunity so excellent to recruit her strength and replenish her resources?

I do not ask if there be common sense in that proposition; I ask *if we have the right to make it.* I pass by the folly involved in such an offer, to speak, for a moment, of its iniquity.

The ninth section of an Act of Congress, commonly called the "Confiscation Act," approved July 17, 1862, reads thus:

"That all slaves of persons who shall hereafter be engaged in rebellion against the Government of the United States, or who shall give aid or comfort thereto, escaping from such persons and taking refuge within the lines of the army; and all slaves captured from such persons or deserted by them and coming under the control of the Government of the United States; and *all slaves of such persons found or being within any place occupied by Rebel forces and afterwards occupied by forces of the United States*, shall be deemed captives of war, and shall be forever free of their servitude, and not again held as slaves."

By the decision of the Supreme Court already cited, *all* the inhabitants of the insurrectionary States are, in law, persons "engaged in rebellion." Therefore, all refugee slaves from insurrectionary States are, by this statute, declared free.

Further: as all the insurrectionary States have been "occupied by Rebel forces," and as we may reasonably conclude that, if we prevail against the South, all these States not already "occupied by forces of the United States" will hereafter be so occupied, it follows that, by the operation of this law, all the slaves in the insurrectionary States, even if no Emancipation Proclamation had ever been issued, would, before the end of the war, have probably been entitled to freedom.

Strictly in the spirit of the above statute, and going only so far beyond it as to declare slaves in portions of the insurrectionary States not yet "occupied by forces of the United States," to be free in advance of such occupation, has been the President's action in the premises. Let us glance at that action.

On the 25th of July, 1862, the President, in pursuance of the act just quoted, issued a Proclamation warning all insurgents

to return to their allegiance within sixty days, on pain of certain forfeitures and seizures.

This warning proving ineffectual, the President, when the sixty days notice had expired, issued a second Proclamation declaring that the slaves held within any State which, on the 1st of January then succeeding, should still be in rebellion against the United States, "shall be then, thenceforth and forever free."

On the 1st of January, 1863, "by virtue of the power in him vested as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States," he declared certain States, namely Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia—certain parishes in Louisiana and certain counties in Virginia excepted—to be then in rebellion against the United States; and he further declared that all slaves in the said ten States, with the exceptions aforesaid, "are, and henceforward shall be, free."

Were these proclamations legal? Had the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States the right to issue them?

Our Supreme Court, in the decision already alluded to, thus indorses a well-known law of war: "The right of one belligerent not only to coerce the other by direct force, but also to cripple his resources by the seizure or destruction of his property, is a necessary result of a state of war."* Or, as Vattel has it: "We have a right to deprive our enemy of his possessions, of everything which may augment his strength and enable him to make war."†

Such seizure or destruction must, of course, take place through the proper military authority. Nor are we to harm an enemy from malice or revenge, but only so far as is "necessary for self-defense, and reasonable security for the time to come."‡

Humanity bids us respect the private property of non-combatants. It is barbarous to burn or pillage dwellings, to lay

---

* Case cited, "*Claimants of Schooners Brilliant,*" &c

† Vattel's "*Law of Nations,*" Book III., § 161.

‡ Work cited, Book III., § 201.

waste farms, to destroy public edifices not military. But if property of an enemy be of a dangerous character, so that its existence imperils the success of the war, or if it be such as has been, or may be, used with effect against us, to prolong the war, we violate the clearest dictates of prudence if we neglect any opportunity to deprive the enemy of it. Thus of ammunition, of quartermaster's and commissary stores. Thus, also, of forts, intrenchments, and the like. Let us apply these principles in the present case.

Certain of our public enemies, with the same rights (and no other) as alien enemies have, held, on the first day of January last, within the above-named insurrectionary States, claims to the service or labor for life of some three millions of persons.

This class of claims is, beyond all else, such property as imperils military success, such as "augments the enemy's strength," such as "enables him to make war," nay, gives him aid on a scale so vast, that without it the war would already, in all reasonable probability, have been brought to a close. It is not, indeed, quartermaster's and commissary stores, but it is that which supplies both. It is not forts or intrenchments, but it serves to build the one, and throw up the other. We cannot more effectually "cripple the resources" of the enemy than by destroying it.

Nor is this all. The dangerous character of this property is attested by the enemy himself. He acknowledges that Jefferson prophesied truly when he predicted that this was the rock upon which the old Union would split. The owners of these claims themselves declare them to have been the immediate cause of the war. What chance have we of domestic tranquillity while they exist? There is—in the nature of things there can be—no security for peace or loyalty from a Slave State.

Does international law exempt such claims from seizure? Are they not to be reckoned as part of an enemy's property? Vattel expressly tells us: "Among the things belonging to the enemy are likewise incorporeal things—all his rights, claims, and debts."*

---

* Vattel's "*Law of Nations*," Book III., § 77.

Therefore, the Confiscation Act, including its ninth section, already quoted, is in strict accordance with the laws of war.

Therefore, too, our Commander-in-Chief was in his right when he took and cancelled the claims to service and labor in the insurrectionary States. The law of nations sanctions the Emancipation Proclamation. By that instrument three millions of slaves were legally set free. The deed is done—righteously, lawfully done. It is true that many of these people are work ing as slaves still; but in the eye of the law, they are freedmen. Our own right to freedom is not better than theirs.

This deed, demanded alike by prudence and justice, forms an era in our national history. It severed the past from the future. It substantially changed, of necessity, the policy of the Government. In the early stage of the war, Congress proposed, and the majority of the nation expected, as the issue of this contest, a mere rehabilitation, with Southern laws and Southern institutions reacknowledged in their pristine form. Again and again warning was given, and the return of the insurgents to their loyal duty on these conditions was urged upon them. But their hearts were hardened, and they would not. By their obstinate perversity they closed the door against themselves. They persevered in their conspiracy against public law until Emancipation became an imperative measure of self-defense. Let us not take credit to ourselves for generous philanthropy. The South, reckless and blind, was the unwitting agent of human liberty. And thus, in the Providence of God, the very effort, by armed treason, to perpetuate an abuse has been the means of effecting its eradication.

That which might have been can no longer be. When politicians talk now of reconstruction, with the "peculiar institution" of the South left intact, the words are nothing else but a mischievous mystification. If the South conquer, she may, by superior force, hold as slaves the negroes who shall remain to her, though by our laws they are free. But for us, there *is* no longer a peculiar institution in any of the insurrectionary states to be left intact. We can build up anew that peculiar institution; not legally, it is very true, for neither the President, nor Congress, nor any judicial tribunal in the land, has any more authority to consign a freeman to slavery than

they have to hang him without crime or trial; but we may build it up, if we have power enough, or connive at it if we are shameless enough; just as a highwayman may seize a purse, or a burglar carry off a basket of silver-ware.

Whether, when we shall have suffered vanquished Treason to dictate her own terms; whether, when we shall have stooped to purchase—not Peace, for God's best blessing cannot so be purchased—but a worthless truce, as brief as treacherous—by an act of usurpation that assumes to assign away the liberties of three millions of free people; whether, when we shall have done this great thing, we shall have any right to set up for more honest or more virtuous than the felon-trader who makes a midnight descent on the Congo coast, and steals thence three or four hundred wretches to crowd the hold of his slave-ship—that will be a question to be settled, at our leisure, with our own consciences.

"The way of the transgressor is hard." It is better to lose fortune than fair fame; and national disgrace is worse than national disaster. A convict, where he is known and remembered as such, may, because of the stain that attaches to him, toil faithfully through half a lifetime, ere men take him again by the hand. And a people, stamped by their own public records as lawless and forsworn, may travel a long and a weary road—a reproach, the while, and a by-word among nations—ere they can take their stand, once more, among the civilized Powers of the earth.

Assuming, what seems probable, that we shall remain victors in this war, suffer me, in conclusion, briefly to group together the main positions that have been advanced.

The inhabitants of the insurrectionary states have, at present, no constitutional right to elect a member to Congress.

We, the inhabitants of the non-insurrectionary states, may, by law, restore to them that right; and with us it rests to decide upon what conditions it shall be restored.

The preliminary condition ought to be some sufficient guaranty that the Emancipation Proclamation shall never be repudiated, and that the institution of slavery shall never again, in any part of the insurrectionary territory, be revived.

Our own national faith, already pledged before the world to three millions of suffering people, demands this. The law of nations permits and enjoins it. We had a right, by that law, to destroy slave-property belonging to a public enemy. It was a national duty to destroy property so dangerous, in order to render that enemy "incapable of doing mischief with the same ease in future."

We offended against no principle of humanity in destroying this property; in other words, in canceling life-long claims to service or labor. The inhumanity would have been to refrain from canceling them.

Nor do we actually harm the slave-claimant by canceling his claims. In point of fact it is greatly to his advantage, socially and pecuniarily, to be without them. Are we impertinently interfering in his business—arrogantly and improperly assuming to judge what is best for him—when we determine this? Not at all. The business is emphatically our own; for it intimately concerns our national safety. In deciding it as we see fit, there is neither impropriety nor arrogance, but proper precaution and prudent foresight. If he had refrained from levying war against his government, he would have had the undoubted right to judge and to act in this affair. As it is, he has lost it; and we have now the right, and the power, to decide the matter; not he.

Before the vacant chairs in Congress are filled, let us make the decision. Failing in this high duty, we sacrifice at once the Public Honor and the Public Safety.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

ROBERT DALE OWEN.

New York, Aug. 27, 1863.

LETTER

FROM

Hon. S. P. CHASE, Secretary of the Treasury,

TO THE

LOYAL NATIONAL LEAGUE.

Washington, April 9, 1863.

Gentlemen: Imperative demands on my time compel me to deny myself the gratification of attending the meeting to which you kindly invite me.

You will meet to send words of cheer to our brave generals and soldiers in the field; to rebuke treason in our midst, giving, in the garb of peace, aid and comfort to treason in the panoply of war; to maintain inviolate the integrity of the national territory, and the supremacy of the national constitution and laws; to strengthen the hands and nerve the heart of the President for the great work to which God and the people have called him. For what worthier purposes can American citizens now assemble?

It is my fixed faith, gentlemen, that God does not mean that this American republic shall perish. We are tried as by fire, but our country will live. Notwithstanding all the violence and all the machinations of traitors and their sympathizers, on this or the other side of the Atlantic, our country will live.

And while our country lives, slavery, the chief source, and cause, and agent of our ills, will die. The friends of the Union in the South, before rebellion, predicted the destruction of slavery as a consequence of secession, if that madness should

prevail. Nothing, in my judgment, is more certain than the fulfilment of these predictions. Safe in the States, before rebellion, from all Federal interference, slavery has come out from its shelter, under State constitutions and laws, to assail the national life. It will surely die, pierced by its own fangs and stings.

What matter now how it dies?—whether as a consequence or object of the war, what matter? Is this a time to split hairs of logic? To me it seems that Providence indicates clearly enough how the end of slavery must come. It comes in rebel slave states, by military order, decree or proclamation; not to be disregarded or set aside in any event as a nullity, but maintained and executed with perfect good faith to all the enfranchised; and it will come in loyal slave states by the unconstrained action of the people and their legislatures, aided freely and generously by their brethren of the free States. I may be mistaken in this, but if I am, another better way will be revealed.

Meantime, it seems to me very necessary to say distinctly what many yet shrink from saying. The American blacks must be called into this conflict—not as cattle, not now, even, as contrabands, but as men. In the free States, and, by the proclamation, in the rebel States, they are free men. The Attorney-General, in an opinion which defies refutation, has pronounced these freemen citizens of the United States. Let then, the example of Andrew Jackson, who did not hesitate to oppose colored regiments to British invasion, be now fearlessly followed. Let these blacks, acclimated, familiar with the country, capable of great endurance, receive suitable military organization, and do their part. We need their good will, and must make them our friends by showing ourselves their friends. We must have them for guides, for scouts, for all military service in camp or field for which they are qualified. Thus employed, from a burden they will become a support, and the hazards, privations, and labors of the white soldiers will be proportionally diminished.

Some will object, of course. They are always objectors to everything practical. Let experience dispel honest fears, and refute captious or disloyal cavil.

Above all, gentlemen, let no doubt rest on our resolution to sustain, with all our hearts and with all our means, the soldiers now in arms for the republic. Let their ranks be filled up; let their supplies be sufficient and regular; let their pay be sure. Let nothing be wanting to them which can ensure activity and efficiency. Let each brave officer and man realize that his country's love attends him, and that his country's hopes hang upon him; and, inspired by this thought, let him dare and do all that is possible to be dared and done.

So, gentlemen, with the blessing of God, will we make a glorious future sure. I see it rising before me, how beautiful and grand! There is not time to speak of it now; but from all quarters of the land comes the voice of the sovereign people, rebuking faction, denouncing treason, and proclaiming the indivisible unity of the republic; and in this Heaven-inspired union of the people, for the sake of the Union, is the sure promise of that splendid Hereafter.

With great respect, yours very truly,

S. P. CHASE.

Hon. GEORGE OPDYKE,
GEORGE GRISWOLD, Esq.,
and others,
Committee of the Loyal National League,
New York.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 26.

LETTER OF

GEN. A. J. HAMILTON

OF TEXAS,

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

New York, July 28th, 1863.

My Dear Sir,—The deep interest felt by me, as a Southern Union man, in the result of measures adopted by you for the maintenance of the National authority in all the States, by the complete and permanent suppression of the rebellion against the Union and the Constitution, will, I trust, excuse the freedom of this letter and my request for your patient consideration of what I write.

I am sure that your desire to have the great issues involved in the present struggle properly and forever settled in not less ardent and constant than my own. Our common wish has common roots in our common aspirations for the honor, prosperity, and unity of the Republic; that which you cherish derives peculiar strength from the great responsibilities of the chief magistracy, and that which animates every pulsation of my heart derives a strength not less peculiar from the fact that the rebellion which imperils our country, desolates my once happy home—deprives of their liberties and puts in jeopardy of their lives my family, my kindred, my friends, and my neighbors.

But it will avail little to procure a temporary adjustment; and I am prompted to address you now because I observe in some quarters indications of a disposition to accept, if not to invite, a peace which would inevitably lead to new convulsions more disastrous than the present.

By some persons of considerable political prominence, and by some leading presses, a systematic effort appears to be put forth to reconcile the public mind to the idea that the future policy of the Government may be formed on the basis of a compromise with the cause of the existing rebellion, which will admit of the re-establishment of slavery in the States where it has been abolished by your proclamation of January last.

To pave the way, apparently, for such a compromise, northern sympathisers with rebellion and some too who cannot justly be so designated, constantly endeavor to impress on the public mind the notion that our National and State Constitutions were made for the white race alone; and that therefore other races can have no rights under them.

No one denies, I believe, that the people of the white race were much more considered in framing our Constitutions than the people of the black race; but the impression sought to be made is that the blacks are *excluded*, by their terms, and by inference, from being regarded as a part of the people for whom they were made.

The proposition so understood I propose briefly to consider; and then to add a few words on the policy to which, it seems to me, it is intended to lead—namely, peace through a full and complete amnesty and the abrogation of your Proclamation of Emancipation.

The Constitutions from which the black population is supposed to be excluded can be only the Federal and State Constitutions.

First, then, is it true of the Constitution of the United States, that it excludes the black race? I have sought in vain for a

section or provision in that instrument which, in terms, sustains the proposition, or which can, by any possible construction, give color to it. I find, in fact, in the Constitution, the converse of the proposition. The third clause of the second section of the first article of the Constitution, is as follows: "Representatives "and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several "States which may be included within this Union according to "their respective numbers, which shall be determined by "adding to the whole number of *free persons*, *including those* "*bound to service for a term of years* and excluding Indians "not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons." The great constituent body which forms the basis of the political department of the Government, is here defined. Of what classes of persons is this body composed? 1st. "*Free persons*," without reference to color or nationality (for no such qualification is expressed, or can be implied), and including in this class of "*free persons*" "those bound to service for a term of years" and "excluding" from the class of "*free persons*" "Indians not taxed;" then added to the body of "*free persons*, including," &c., "three-fifths of *all other persons*," meaning by this description of "all other persons," the slaves of the South. Who then were the "free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years?" They are not *slaves* of whom only three-fifths can be counted—nor are they Indians not taxed. Is it true that they who are white alone belong to this class? Whence comes the idea, and what are the proofs Who were the persons who, for the most part, were held to service for a term of years, at the period of the adoption of the Constitution? I believe it is a part of the history of the country, that in some of the States, at that very time, Africans or their descendants were held to labor for a term of years. If so, they were included in the class of "free persons," in the very *terms* of the provision referred to, and were *intended* to be included. So too the black man who was

neither held to labor for a term of years nor for life, but who was a "free person," was included in the language and the spirit of the Constitution. To this obvious construction the Southern States have committed themselves, by counting the free blacks among their "*free persons*" in determining their representation.

If those who maintain the theory of exclusion will point to some clause or provision in the Constitution which sustains it, the country will be better prepared for its consideration.

Even the slaves are not thought unworthy of recognition, and are, to the extent of three-fifths of their number, made a part of the aggregate constituency of the political department of the Government.

But because this and other provisions of the Constitution were made in reference to their condition of slavery, is it to be said that when they shall have ceased to be slaves they are, by some silent and unseen provision of the Constitution, to be excluded from all its provisions? If their condition be changed from slavery to freedom, the effect of such change upon their status under the clause of the Constitution quoted, is to incorporate them with that class from which there is no deduction in fixing the basis of representation. In what manner, then and by what provision of the Constitution of the United States are negroes, when free, excluded from recognition?

If we search the State Constitutions, there will be found in many, if not most of those of the free States, express recognition of the black man.

In that of the State of New York they are, under the description of "men of color," allowed to vote when they shall have been, for three years, citizens of the State, and for one year preceding the election at which they propose to vote, have been seized and possessed of a freehold estate of the value of two hundred and fifty dollars, above all debts and encumbrances

thereon, and upon which they have paid a tax. I might refer to the Constitution of Massachusetts, and of many of the other States, for similar provisions, but it is unnecessary. In the face of such clear *affirmative* constitutional recognition, a declaration to the contrary may, perhaps, challenge admiration for its boldness.

If we are now to learn that the black race are ignored and excluded from citizenship by the Constitutions of States, by which they are required to perform all the ordinary duties pertaining to the citizen, and allowed the highest rights of freemen, including the right of suffrage—if the Constitution of New York excludes them, how, under its provisions, can they vote? And why and how is it that to-day, they are being drawn, as conscripts, under the late act of Congress?

Native-born men—free men—wielding a portion of the political power of Government, Federal as well as State, and with arms in their hands to defend the flag of the former—are not, whether white or black, without the pale of constitutional recognition.

The resort for proof of the correctness of the proposition under consideration will be, most probably, to the Constitutions of the Slave States. If so, then I have only to say, they are not the *only*, nor yet a *majority* of the Constitutions of this country, and do not therefore, prove the truth of the proposition—and, that if the extinction of slavery is a result of the rebellion, then it may be that even in the South some meaning and force may be attached to that provision of the Constitution of the United States, which declares that "The citizens of each State shall be "entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in "the several States."

The proposition that the Government can and ought to force the colonization, in distant lands, of the negroes, when free, is as reprehensible in principle, and as unsupported by constitu-

itenal authority, as is the one just disposed of. The power o-do this is claimed for the Government—(for it would be unt oharitable to suppose that its asserters would insist upon the Government taking so important a step without full authority)—to compel the black race to accept expatriation from the United States as a condition of freedom. If this power exists in the Government, I insist that the country shall be informed where it has been so long hidden away, and where it is now lodged. What provision of the Constitution confers it, either expressly, or as an incident of an express power? Every earnest thinker will desire to know, not only the source of the power, but the department of the Government to which it has been confided. Touching these important inquiries those who favor the policy of deportation are entirely silent. Much is said about the physical and mental inferiority of the black race, and we are left no alternative but to infer that the power is claimed for Government: 1st, because they (the blacks) are excluded from recognition by the Constitutions of the country; 2d, because they are physically and mentally inferior to the white race; and, 3d, (for such is a part of the argument), because if the two races are permitted to remain together, after the emancipation of the blacks, amalgamation will soon produce a piebald race, to the great detriment of society and government.

I say again that the favorers of this policy could never have urged it upon the country, unless they believed there was power in the Government to adopt and enforce it. Then, it must be, by application of the facts assumed in argument not to any particular provision, but to the whole body of the Constitution, that they distil the subtle power. The first of these assumed facts I have done with. The second I shall not dispute. I shall content myself with questioning the power of Government *to discriminate against* one class, or description, or nationality, of those

within its jurisdiction, because of physical or mental inferiority to some other class, or description, or nationality.

This would cease to be a free government the moment the power should be permitted to it to determine, that because of difference of race—of color—of physical inferiority, or mental development, the right of the citizen could be determined.

If unhappily such power shall ever be exercised, it might, and probably would, upon a principle of impartiality, be applied to all alike. The principle could no doubt find its advocates, while there is just as little reason to doubt that some of them would fall the first victims to its impartial enforcement.

If on account of color—race—or physical or mental inferiority one class of people can be forcibly ejected from the territory of the Government, as a measure of policy, or on the plea of necessity—(the tyrant's plea the wide world over)—where will bounds be fixed to limit its exercise as often and upon whatever class of citizens the majority in power may, from time to time, desire?

Neither the foreign born or native citizens could rest easy under such a precedent.

As to precisely what would result in the way of amalgamation, from the two races living together in freedom, I cannot say. I am not sufficiently versed in physiology to determine what increased physical affinities of the two races would be developed by the blacks becoming free. I feel morally certain that the *facilities* for amalgamation would not thereby be increased.

The final argument in favour of the power claimed for the Government may be yet held in reserve. If so, perhaps it will be found, when pushed forward, to be something like this—"Africans and their descendants are *not and cannot* be citizens under the Constitution of the United States, and have no rights which white men are bound to respect."

I shall not review the Dred Scott decision. The legal and

logical correctness of the opinion of the Court was, at the time it was pronounced, met by two learned Justices, not surpassed, if equalled, in the just estimation of the bar or of the country, by any other members of the Court, in dissenting opinions which have not been, and will never be, successfully answered; and the philosophic historian of our country has already truly traced its inhuman spirit and disastrous reasoning to the attempt of Southern slave owners to overthrow free government for the majority of the white race, the more firmly to rivet the chains upon the black race, which has culminated in this gigantic rebellion. Two and a half years of revolution, while they have been full of sorrows, have not been unfruitful of honest inquiry leading to the discovery and acknowledgment of truth. The great Teacher has from day to day impressed new ideas upon the public mind and suggested means adequate to the necessities of the hour. The despised negro, whose perpetual bondage was the leading object of the effort to overthrow free government, was at last considered by the Government as a possible means of aiding in its preservation. As freemen, they would no longer constitute the chief laboring and producing population of the rebellious States, but become soldiers of the Government, stimulated by its solemn act, which proclaimed their freedom before all the world and in the sight of Heaven. The result of that Proclamation is that they are to-day, many of them, in the ranks of our armies, and have already, on historic battle-fields, vindicated their right to freedom by their heroic defence of the flag of the free. They are native born—they live and have ever lived in the United States. They are free—they are fighting and dying for free government—for *this* Government. Why are they not its citizens? They are citizens in *fact*, in *reason*, and by every right that confers citizenship. And so they will henceforth be considered—the law proceeding from the right—and he who, ten years hence, shall dispute the fact will be pitied rather than blamed.

What shall be said of the final proposition—" full pardon to the rebels, and the abrogation of your Proclamation of Emancipation?" There is nothing of opposition to free government, or of wrong to humanity and civilization, that is not embraced in this proposition. It justifies the rebellion in its acts and purposes—it asks, in effect, that the Government shall become the accuser of those who have labored most zealously to sustain and preserve it. It asks the Government to do more—to descend to a depth of infamy beyond that ever reached by any other—to admit, in the face of Christendom, that the Proclamation of Freedom to the Slaves was a deliberate cheat, meant only to dupe, for the time being, the anti-slavery sentiment of the world; and especially to deceive the negro, to the end that he might be induced to engage in the contest, the sooner to force the rebel master to receive him back and to acknowledge that he holds him under the Constitution of the United States.

In this connection it is well to remember that this *anti-slavery sentiment* is the fixed condition of the public mind of the civilized world. And to this sentiment, more than to all other causes, do we owe the fact that *non-intervention* by foreign governments in the great struggle now pending here, has so far been maintained.

At the period when the governing classes of some of the governments of the Old World, sympathizing with the aristocratic principle of slavery, and deeply interested in the preservation of the privileges of class, were just ready to proclaim intervention in American affairs, the Proclamation of Freedom to the slaves, issued by you as President of the United States and in solemn form, and the concurrent assertion of the rebels in the South, of their determination to maintain slavery as the corner stone of their new government, so awakened that deep sentiment of hostility to slavery in the masses of the people of those

governments, and so attracted their active sympathies to this Government, as to effectually forestall intervention.

And to this sentiment thus aroused and stimulated by your grand Proclamation, and now outspoken in England, do we owe it to-day to be thankful that we see the emancipation party holding—*and holding firmly*, under the able guidance of John Bright—the balance of power in that Government.

In France too even Imperial power has not, so far, openly opposed the national sympathy on the side of freedom. If we are destined to encounter foreign enemies in this struggle, it will be most likely when by a vacillating policy in support of the Proclamation, or its abandonment, we have forfeited the confidence, the respect, and moral aid of the friends of freedom throughout the world. With the sympathies of Christendom with us, intervention is but a possibility—against us, it is a certainty.

The effect which a disavowal and retraction of the Proclamation would have upon the public mind of other nations is evident. It would at once paralyze the efforts of those who have hitherto stayed the action of their governments in proposed interference in our affairs.

It would weaken, if not destroy, the liberal party of France and England—it would surely convert them from friends to enemies of this Government, and thus break down the most powerful barrier to intervention and foreign war. Thus self-interest and national safety should alone suffice to prevent such madness.

But there is an argument higher than these which appeals directly to every Christian heart—an argument used by yourself in the terms of the Proclamation.

"*Upon this act—sincerely believed* (so runs the instrument) *to be an act of justice warranted by the Constitution upon military necessity—I invoke the considerate judgment of mankind and the gracious favor of Almighty God.*"

Thus did the chief of a Christian people, before mankind, and in the sight of God, proclaim freedom to the slave, and by his official signature to the great act commit himself to its wisdom, its justice, and its constitutionality, and to the efficiency of its provisions.

That act was in pursuance of an act of Congress authorizing it. The power in the Congress to declare war carries with it, the power to provide the means and prescribe the necessary measures to make the war effective. It was in the exercise of this power that Congress acted. The war-making power, which is also the law-making power of the Government, said to the President, the commander-in-chief of its armies, Do this thing, and it was done. It is unprofitable to attempt to prove to those who are unwilling to believe, that the act was constitutional. The majority of the people of the United States and of the civilized world so believe it and so sanction it.

If your proclamation was not then a mere assumption of power, but a valid act, done in the exercise of constitutional discretion, what power can abrogate or annul it? The act, if constitutionally done, is as irrevocable as is the act of the President in signing an act passed by the Congress. In either case discretion and power cease with the act. When the proclamation was issued it became the *law* of freedom to the slaves therein embraced—a law which I repeat is irrevocable by any power in the Government. Laws which are general in their character and create no vested right in the citizen, may be changed or repealed—but those which create personal rights and vest them in the citizen are protected from infraction by constitutional guarantees. A legislative grant to land cannot be revoked at the pleasure of the power making the grant. The enfranchisement of hundreds of thousands of people by the Government—the solemn act which raises them from

slavery to freedom—is surely not less sacred and inviolable. There is no power in this Government to make slaves of freemen, white or black. While the civilized world has hailed the act with joy, it would shudder at an effort to recall it or impair its vital force. The policy of such a course would be as fatal to the peace and welfare of the country as the act would be atrocious in principle.

Those who propose it surely cannot yet comprehend the real design of the rebellion, and the change which it has produced in the relations of the different classes in the South. A restoration of "the Union as it was," to use a cant phrase of the day, is not a possible thing. If it means a restoration with slavery, then it will not be a Union of peace, prosperity, and happiness, but a Union of discord, hatred, and violence in the South which will sink it in barbarism. Can we hope for peace between the sections now at war, with slavery still existing? But if this were possible, how can it be expected that the rebels and loyal men of the South can live in peace in the future, the cause of the trouble—*slavery*—still in existence, the rebel masters more intolerant, jealous, and brutal than ever before, with arrogance increased by the victory which they will have achieved over the people and Government of the United States and the moral and political opinions of the civilized world? I know well that there are those who are impatient when "loyal men South" are mentioned in the consideration of these questions. Nevertheless, I insist most respectfully, but earnestly, that they *are* worthy of consideration because of their devotion to liberty and their Government, because of their sacrifices and sufferings, and because they constitute the only future strength of the Government in the South. They are today the *majority* of the South, whatever may be said or thought to the contrary. Their vindication is certain, if slow. Time will prove that the great body of the citizens of the South will

gratefully return to the Union of their fathers, while it will more fully develope the undying hatred to free government of less than 300,000 slaveholders.

We need not further shut our eyes to the nature and disposition of the antagonistic forces now in conflict in this war. Men need not wonder at the convulsion resulting from the conspiracy, created solely by the pro-slavery spirit that plotted the rebellion. This conspiracy is now known to have embraced various objects in its scope. The determination to hold in bondage four millions of colored people with their increase, and to make such bondage perpetual, was the main object of the conspiracy. This determination formed the basis of all other measures, whether of intrigue, war, or diplomacy. It entered into every plan and calculation of the rebel leaders. The attempt to destroy the national unity grew out of the conspiracy against the colored man, and became necessary to accomplish the scheme of his perpetual bondage. There was an obstacle in the way. There were seven millions of non-slaveholders in the South. How could it be otherwise than that this population should, at no distant day, stand upon its rights and dictate that policy which should accord with its interests? It was the apprehension of this that led to the conspiracy against the political rights of these masses. It was a truth fully realized by the leading conspirators that slavery could not long exist against a union of the free labor forces North and South, blended by common sympathy; therefore the national unity must be destroyed. They said, "Slavery and democracy are incompatible," and this involved the necessity of a monopoly of political power by the slaveholders in order to maintain in perpetuity their political property in slaves. These are the motives which led them to attempt the destruction of the Government.

What has the nation now to say to this active intrigue to postpone the destruction of slavery, which is the antagonist of

free government? Can it be possible that any man of sense, or judgment, desires such postponement? I ask you to contemplate the fruits of that narrow policy which has disfranchised a large portion of the white population South. I ask our countrymen to consider that educational neglect and political debauchment of the South, which have changed it from an element of national strength into an agency for the attempted accomplishment of national ruin. Compare the condition of the Southern white masses in their industrial interests with that of other sections. Let the political economist tell us what it is that gives the annual *per capita* production of $166.00 to every man, woman, and child in Massachusetts, whilst in South Carolina productive labor yields a *per capita* of $56.00 only. He will trace this disparity to the direct influence of slavery. The political philosopher may carry the inquiry farther, and show why it is that so much of the population of the North has become a questionable element of national strength. He will find the reason for it in a long continued sympathy with slavery. The encouragement of the slave system of the South by the North has progressed until it has so far contaminated not only Southern but even Northern society, as to seriously imperil the security of the nation.

It might have been supposed that the teachings of events would have set us right ere this. It seems, however, that the calamities of the country have had no power to instruct the political intriguers. Upon such, the active treason of the South, its attempt to destroy the nationality, the plot to overthrow free government, the claims of the masses of the South for protection, and all consideration of future security, are as nothing compared with the preservation of slavery—their only principle is *slavery conservatism*. The time has come for conservatism in the right direction. I think we have had enough of *slavery* conservatism. If we must still be conservatives, let

us be conservatives of freedom; encouragers of humanity; promoters of such policy as makes men patriots, and keeps them so; and radical opposers of whatever tends to destroy republican government.

Every man in the country who still clings to the hope of a great nationality under the old ensign, desires the unity of our people. Upon what basis is this unity to be brought about? Slavery has pronounced democracy to be its opponent. Will unity be brought about by upholding slavery? It has aimed at the destruction of the national life. Will the national life be prolonged and secured by cherishing its antagonist? Slavery has conspired against the political rights of the non-slaveholding masses of the South. Is this in accordance with that just conservatism embraced in that clause of the Constitution which guaranties republican government to the people of all the States? It has unscrupulously aimed at the establishment of an order of nobility in the South, and endeavors to make its escape from under the Constitution which interdicts it. Will the further toleration of an institution which has attempted all this produce unity? Through the intrigues prompted by the pro-slavery spirit, the nation has been precipitated into civil war. The whole number of slaveholders has been more than equalled by the white men who have fallen in the conflict. What kind of a monument does slavery conservatism propose to erect to the memory of those thus sacrificed? Slavery will leave a war debt of gigantic magnitude for free industry to pay. In what way will conservatism reconcile the toil of the nation to the cause of its manifold calamities? Not, I apprehend, by pandering to slavery, and making it the basis of future intrigue and revolution.

The nation has had enough of *slavery* conservatism. It now demands not only a change, but a *radical* change. The future security of the nation depends upon the policy which shall be

now adopted. Its strength results from civil liberty and free government—its only weakness has been the institution of slavery, which thwarted the development of those ideas. The great South, embracing more than eleven millions of human beings, all under proper guidance, an effective element of national strength, has one enemy only—that is *slavery conservatism.* The twenty millions of people in the North have had one insidious, mercenary, and atrocious enemy—*Slavery Conservatism!* The nation at large has had one enemy—*Slavery Conservatism!* The example in our country is only a repetition of what has been witnessed in all others. The process in freeing nations of the barbarisms of slavery has generally been slow, owing to the weakness of the anti-slavery forces. We have one advantage. The twenty millions of people devoted to free labor have it now in their power to make short work of American slavery. We shall soon know whether conservatism will make chronic the national disease, or whether a rapid and radical cure shall be effected. In the convalescence of this nation the open traitors may not prove to be its worst enemies.

The nation can no longer afford to indulge party tacticians in that line of intrigue which has heretofore proved its bane. The cause of nationality and free government is not alone in danger from domestic foes. The fall of Mexico, through weakness, created by factions, should warn us. The usurper is already triumphing over the ruins of republican government in that unhappy country. No one can doubt the concurrent desires between that usurper and the anti-democratic spirit which to-day animates and controls the rebellion. At this moment negotiations are pending, if not consummated, between the leading rebels in Texas who despair of success by the so-called Confederacy, and parties in northern Mexico, for a union of Texas with the States of Tamaulipas and Neuvo Leon and Coa-

huila for the formation of a new government under the imperial sanction and favor of Louis Napoleon. This will give the long coveted opportunity to this despot to interfere in the affairs of this country with sufficient plausibility to relieve the act from the overwhelming censure of the French nation. If we are not now, we will at no distant day be standing upon the law of force and the preparation of the nation for warfare to save us from intervention. This is the only security we have. There are 800,000 colored men in the South, loyal by both nature and circumstance, the enemies of those who would overthrow the nationality, and capable of being made allies in the common cause of freedom, justice, and humanity. This force is not to be despised, for it is a force that can be counted on in any emergency that may call it into requisition. It has one simple platform in the ideal of its future—the desire to be free, and fidelity to the power that makes it free. It is this simple platform that may make the colored man an immense power on the side of nationality. It is worth more to the nation to-day, if properly treated, than all the slaveholders, coupled with all those who are now mouthing that abused word "conservatism." Conservatism for a long time repulsed the colored man and made him the efficient ally of the rebels. Alarm for the cause of nationality changed the policy, and commenced making the colored man the ally of freedom.

I know that there are those who, while they desire the freedom of the slaves, are greatly troubled to determine what should be done with them afterwards. And I have also observed that most frequently those who know least of the slaves of the South are most anxious in mind upon the subject. In three words the proper policy can be stated—

Let them alone.

There is no rightful power in the Government to force them from its territory—besides, it will be found that the late masters

in the South and others will clamor more loudly against their speedy deportation than they now do against their freedom.

They will need, and must have, their labor (not forced but paid) until time and a change of population in the South shall dfurnish an adequate supply of white labor. When this perio arrives it is most probable, nay, it is certain, that the black race will begin to desire a home and a government exclusively their own. And then I shall be glad, if living, to see this Government extend a strong and generous hand to assist them. If we will, to-day, take care of the rebellion and its cause, as against domestic and foreign foes, the question of the future of the negro will take care of itself.

By your just Proclamation you gave the highest earthly sanction to the wise and noble policy of the enfranchisement of the black man, and by his enrollment in your armies for the defence of the country, you have confirmed it to the benefit of the nation. You will be urged to revoke that act. God forbid that you should listen to such advisers and so rob yourself of the gratitude and admiration of mankind.

The utterance of these sentiments may by some be deemed out of place and unseasonable. I can better afford to bear the censure of such than to forego my convictions of truth and duty.

With sincere wishes for your health and welfare,

I am very respectfully,

Your obedient servant,

A. J. HAMILTON.

To The President of the United States.

☞ *Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No.* 863 *Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.*

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 27.

NULLIFICATION

AND

COMPROMISE;

A RETROSPECTIVE VIEW.

By JOHN MASON WILLIAMS.



NEW YORK, OCTOBER, 1863.

New York:
FRANCIS & LOUTREL, STATIONERS & PRINTERS,
No. 45 Maiden Lane.

1863.

NOTE.

The author of this review wrote, in December, 1860, some brief notices of the nullification controversy, which were published, at the time, in a newspaper of quite limited circulation. Should any one who has read and now remembers those notices, read this review, the fact that both were written by the same person will account for any coincidences of thought and expression which may be discovered in the two publications.

In the marginal references in the ensuing pages, the volume, of which the title is placed at the head of this review, is cited simply as "State Papers." "Bent. Abr." is intended as an abbreviation of "Benton's Abridgment of Debates in Congress."

RETROSPECTIVE VIEW.

STATE PAPERS OF NULLIFICATION, including the public Acts of the Convention of the People of South Carolina assembled at Columbia, November 19, 1832, and March 11, 1833; the Proclamation of the President of the United States, and the proceedings of the several State Legislatures which have acted on the subject. Collected and published by order of the General Court of Massachusetts under the direction of the Committee on the Library. Boston: Dutton & Wentworth, Printers to the State. 1834. 8vo. pp. 381.

A GENERATION has passed away and another has taken its place since the chivalry of South Carolina assumed a hostile attitude towards the government of the United States, and undertook, in the plenitude of an assumed absolute and paramount sovereignty, to nullify certain laws of the national government, and forcibly to resist their execution within the limits of her territory. This was an important event in our political history. It was one of the outbursts of that "irrepressible conflict" between freedom and slavery about which so much has been said and written, and which is now raging with accumulated intensity. Believing as we do, that a great mistake was committed by our government on that occasion, and that we are now suffering the bitter consequences of that mistake, it may be useful to review the history of the nullification controversy, and to learn wisdom from the lessons which it inculcates. Many active politicians of the present day were then either unborn or too young to feel an interest, and to take a part in the discussions and measures to which that controversy gave rise. Others, of a more advanced age, may have forgotten them in the lapse of intermediate years, and may not now have within their reach, the necessary documents to refresh their memories. As "history is philosophy teach-

ing by example," it is well occasionally to pause and listen to its teachings.

The cause, or pretext, of the insurrectionary movement of South Carolina, in 1832, was the alleged unconstitutionality of the Acts of Congress imposing duties on imports in a manner, and with the intent to protect American manufactures against foreign competition,—a policy which had been pursued from the very commencement of our national government. At the first session of the first Congress—quite a number of the members of which had been members of the Convention that framed the Constitution—the subject was introduced as soon as it could be after the organization of the body. Mr. Madison, one of the most intelligent, efficient and vigilant of those members, who had a perfect knowledge and recollection of the intended meaning and true construction of the provisions of that instrument, introduced a resolution declaring that certain duties should be laid on importations of merchandise. By the scheme then proposed, specific duties were to be imposed on certain enumerated articles, the avowed purpose of which was the protection of American manufactures against foreign competition. Marshall, in his life of Washington says, that on the necessity of an immediate revenue, no division of sentiment could exist, and on the protective policy an equal degree of unanimity seemed to prevail.* The second Act passed by that Congress—the second Act approved and signed by President Washington, (who was also the President of the Constitutional Convention,) after his inauguration, as if to establish an authoritative, cotemporaneous construction of the Constitution on that subject, bore on its front an express declaration that one of its objects was the encouragement and protection of American manufactures. For more than thirty years thereafter, the same policy, under all administrations, was steadily pursued as the settled policy of the government.

In 1808 the State of South Carolina declared, by a Legislative Act, that the establishment and encouragement of domestic manufactures is conducive to the interest of a State

* Vol. 5, p. 195.

and the means of disposing to advantage of the surplus productions of the agriculturist; and not only expedient, but politic in rendering us independent of foreign nations. So, in 1816, Mr. Calhoun, and his colleagues in Congress from South Carolina, were strenuous advocates for the establishment of the protective tariff of that year. But unfortunately Andrew Jackson and John C. Calhoun became rival candidates for the presidency of the United States. The star of Jackson obtained the ascendant, and Calhoun's lofty aspirations were blasted. Soon after that time a most bitter personal, as well as political animosity sprung up between the two rivals, and a knot of politicians in South Carolina, with Mr. Calhoun as their leader, made the wonderful discovery that this long-established system of our national policy was a rank usurpation of power and a palpable violation of the Constitution,—a violation so palpable, unjust and tyrannical, that it would not only justify, but that it required the interposition of the State to resist by force, and even by a dissolution of the Union, if necessary, the usurpation. Accordingly the chivalry buckled on their armor and sallied forth, like the brave Knight of La Mancha, to deliver the nation from an oppression which it had so long, though patiently, and even unconsciously endured. The result was nullification in 1832.

There appears to be a general—an almost universal—popular impression that President Jackson, by his prompt and energetic measures, effectually "put down" nullification, and crushed the incipient rebellion of South Carolina in 1833. This is an erroneous impression. To "put down," as the phrase is used in this connexion, is to *suppress*, to crush by superior physical or moral force. The example given by Johnson is, "as to put down a party." This is also the popular sense; and in this sense nullification was not put down by President Jackson, or any one else, in 1833, or any other time. Substantially all that it demanded was surrendered to it by Congress, on the urgent recommendation of President Jackson himself. This may probably be thought a very bold and rash assertion, but we make it without misgiving or hesitation, because we

propose to establish its truth by the incontestible evidence of official and other cotemporaneous documents. We do this, not for the purpose of extinguishing a single ray of the halo that properly surrounds the memory of Jackson, or of removing from the chaplet of his fame a single leaf that belongs to it, but to vindicate the truth of history, which is of greater public importance than the reputation of an individual, and to urge a vigorous and persevering discharge of the duties which that historic truth inculcates in our present national emergency.

On the 24th of November, 1832, the people of South Carolina, in a paroxysm of excitement, passed, in convention, "An Ordinance to nullify certain Acts of the Congress of the United States purporting to be laws laying duties and imposts on the importation of foreign commodities." The ordinance declares and ordains "that the several Acts and parts of Acts of the Congress of the United States purporting to be laws for the imposing of duties and imposts on foreign commodities," especially several Acts therein named by their titles, "are null, void, and no law, nor binding upon the State, its officers, or citizens." It further declared that it should not be lawful for any of the constituted authorities of the State or of the United States to enforce the payment of duties imposed by the Acts of Congress thus nullified; and made it the duty of the Legislature to adopt such measures and pass such Acts as may be necessary to give full effect to the ordinance, and to prevent the enforcement, and arrest the operation, of those acts of Congress, within the limits of the State, after the first day of February then next.* The Legislature obeyed the injunction, as will appear in the sequel.

The preamble to the ordinance declares that "the Congress of the United States, by various Acts purporting to be acts laying duties and imposts on foreign imports, but in reality intended for the protection of domestic manufactures," &c., "hath exceeded its just powers under the Constitution, which confers on it no authority to afford such

* State Papers, p. 28.

protection, and hath violated the true meaning and intent of the Constitution," &c.

The Convention then issued an address "to the people of South Carolina," and another address "to the people of Massachusetts, Virginia," &c., naming each of the other States then composing the Union as an independent sovereignty. This fact has some significance, as it entirely ignores our nationality, and it can hardly be supposed that this form of address was merely accidental. But let that pass. In this address, the Convention state very explicitly and distinctly the *gravamen* of their complaint,—what South Carolina had a right to require, and what, in her generous condescension and chivalrous magnanimity, she was willing to accept as an atonement for the alleged injuries she had, with such exemplary patience, endured. We state the terms of the compromise proposed by the convention in the language of the address.

"We believe," says the address, "that upon every just and equitable principle of taxation, the whole list of protected articles should be imported free of all duty; and that the revenue derived from import duties should be raised exclusively from the unprotected articles, or that whenever a duty is imposed upon protected articles, an excise duty of the same rate should be imposed upon all similar articles manufactured in the United States." "But we are willing to make a large offering to preserve the Union, and with a distinct declaration that it is a concession on our part, we will consent that the same rate of duty may be imposed upon the protected articles that shall be imposed upon the unprotected, *provided*, that no more revenue be raised than is necessary to meet the demands of the government for Constitutional purposes." "Our resolve is fixed and unalterable, that a protecting tariff shall be no longer enforced within the limits of South Carolina."* Here we have the nullifier's *ultimatum*. The only alternative they present is, in substance, submission to their demands, or war and disunion.

The Convention then ordered that copies of the ordinance

* State Papers, &c., pp. 69, 71.

with the report thereon, and of the addresses to the people of South Carolina and of the other States should be transmitted to the President of the United States, to be by him submitted to Congress, and also to the Governors of the several States for the information of their respective Legislatures.* The Convention adjourned on the 24th of November, 1832, to meet again at such time as should be appointed by its President.† Thus ended the first session of this traitorous Convention.

Before proceeding to a review of the measures adopted by the national government on this occasion, it may be well to notice briefly the acts of the Legislatures of the several States in relation to this nascent rebellion of South Carolina. We will notice them in the order in which they are named in the address of the Convention. In this order Massachusetts stands first. The Legislature of that State referred the consideration of the subject to a joint committee of both branches, of which A. H. Everett, a brother of Edward Everett, was chairman. The committee, on the 15th of February, 1833, reported a series of resolves, preceded by an elaborate discussion of the principles involved in the nullification controversy. The report was accepted, and the resolves passed and approved by Levi Lincoln, then Governor of the State, March 11, 1833. The resolves declared, among other things, that the President was bound, by the express provisions of the Constitution, and by his oath of office, to take care that the laws are faithfully executed; that the proclamation issued by him, the 10th November, 1832, is a judicious, well-timed and salutary measure; that they approve the determination therein expressed to enforce the laws; and that they are prepared to support him and the other constituted authorities of the Union, in all necessary, suitable, constitutional and legal measures which they may be called upon to adopt for that purpose.‡

The State of Virginia was less emphatic in her condemnation. She appointed an envoy or agent to proceed to

* State Papers, p. 318. † Id. 320.

‡ State Papers, p. 111, *et sequentes.*

South Carolina to induce a suspension of the execution of the ordinance of nullification, and passed among others, a resolve declaring in substance that the State rights doctrines of the Virginia resolutions of 1798 do not sanction the proceedings of South Carolina, indicated in her ordinance.*

A committee of the Legislature of New York, to whom the address and proceedings of South Carolina were referred, made a long and able report, concluding with several resolves, which were adopted. The resolves declared that the Legislature approves the measures the President has adopted and recommended to sustain the authority and execute the laws of the United States; and that the government and people of the State will cordially co-operate with him in the exercise of all the means which may be necessary and proper to secure those objects.†

The Pennsylvania Legislature resolved that every resistance to the collection of duties imposed upon importations by law, is an offence against the Constitution and laws of the United States; and that the offenders are liable to prosecution and punishment; that in enforcing by all constitutional means the laws for imposing and collecting duties upon imported goods, and all other Acts of Congress, and in bringing to punishment all persons who, under any pretence, may offer resistance to them, Pennsylvania will aid and assist the government of the United States by all the means in her power.‡

North Carolina resolved that the doctrine of nullification as avowed by the State of South Carolina, and lately promulgated in an ordinance, is revolutionary in its character, subversive of the constitution of the United States, and leads to a dissolution of the Union.§

Some of the resolves of the State of Maryland are so appropriate to the present times, and so applicable to the secessionists of that State, that we cannot forbear to give their substance. They declare that the government of the United States possesses all the powers necessary for the purposes for which it was instituted; that it is irreconcila-

* State Papers, p. 197. † Id. 158. ‡ Id. p. 169. § 201.

ble with the objects and purposes for which the Constitution was adopted, to suppose that it contains in itself the principles of its own destruction, or has failed to endue the government created by it with the essential power of self-preservation; that it is not in the power of any State to annul an Act of the general Government as void or unconstitutional; and that if any State should attempt to withdraw from the Union, it is the right and duty of the general Government to protect itself and the other States from the fatal consequences of any such attempt.*

One of the resolves of the Legislature of Connecticut declares that "this Assembly do most fully approve the essential principles and the determination avowed by the President, in his proclamation of the 10th of December, 1832, and that this Assembly and the people of this State will cordially and faithfully co-operate with him in carrying the same into effect."†

The Legislature of New Hampshire resolved that "the sentiments contained in the proclamation of the President of the United States, dated December 10, 1832, meet with the entire approbation of this Legislature."‡

In Maine, the Legislature resolved that "the patriotic spirit and tone of the President's recent proclamation relating to the extraordinary proceedings of South Carolina, meet our warmest approbation."§

The New Jersey Legislature resolved that "we deprecate the acts and proceedings of our brethren of South Carolina, as opposed to the fundamental principles upon which the government of these United States is based; as violating the spirit and meaning of the Federal Constitution, and tending to rend asunder those ties of common interest and fraternal regard which are our pride, our glory and our strength; that the principles contained in the President's proclamation meet our entire approbation, and that we will sustain the Chief Magistrate in the Constitutional enforcement of those principles."‖

A resolve of the Legislature of Georgia declares, "We

* State Papers, p. 289 *et sequentes.* † 285. ‡ Id. 101.
§ Id. 108. ‖ Id. 105.

abhor the doctrine of nullification as neither a peaceful nor a Constitutional remedy, but, on the contrary, as tending to civil commotion and disunion; and while we deplore the rash and revolutionary measures recently adopted by a Convention of the people of South Carolina, we deem it a paramount duty to warn our fellow-citizens against the danger of adopting her mischievous policy."*

Delaware, small in territory, but then strong in patriotism, did not lag behind her sister States in her devotion to the Union, the Constitution and the enforcement of the laws. She resolved that the people of the United States owe to the National Government an allegiance which cannot be withdrawn either by individuals or masses of individuals, without its consent; that the Convention of South Carolina can have no other or greater right to annul or resist the laws of Congress than any assemblage of an equal number of individuals in any part of the United States; nor can any assemblage, however large, have any other or greater right for such purpose than belongs to each individual citizen, considered as a Constitutional measure; that we cordially respond to the sentiments on this subject contained in the able proclamation of the President of the United States, and shall be, at all times, prepared to support the Government in the exercise of its Constitutional rights and discharge of its Constitutional duties.†

Ohio resolved that the doctrine that a State has the power to nullify a law of the General Government is revolutionary in its character, and is, in its nature, calculated to overthrow the great temple of American liberty. Such a course cannot absolve that allegiance which the people of this Union owe to the supremacy of the laws.‡

The State of Indiana declared that we deeply deplore the political heresies and threatened disorganization recently promulgated by a portion of our brethren of South Carolina; that the Constitutional doctrines advanced, and views of policy embraced in the President's proclamation on the present difficulties in South Carolina, the patriotic spirit pervading that able document, and the prompt and

* State Papers, p. 274. † Id. 190. ‡ Id. 106.

decided manner in which he has rebuked the pernicious doctrines and unjustifiable course recently adopted by a portion of the citizens of that State, command our entire approbation.*

The Legislature of Mississippi resolved that the doctrine of nullification is contrary to the letter and spirit of the Constitution, and in direct conflict with the welfare, safety and independence of every State in the Union; and that we will, with heart and hand, sustain the President in the full exercise of his legitimate powers to maintain unsullied and unimpaired, the honor, the independence and the integrity of the Union.†

The State of Illinois resolved, that should the anti-republican doctrine of nullification be persisted in, and treason rear its polluted form within the bosom of our prosperous, patriotic and peaceful Republic, we do hereby instruct our Senators in Congress, and request our Representatives to unite in the most speedy and vigorous measures on the part of the General Government, for the preservation of the peace, integrity and honor of the Union. And we solemnly pledge the faith of our State in support of the administration of the laws and Constitution of our beloved country.‡

The Alabama Legislature resolved that nullification is unsound in theory and dangerous in practice; that as a remedy it is unconstitutional and essentially revolutionary, leading to anarchy and civil discord, and finally to the dissolution of the Union; that we earnestly entreat the people of this State to avoid those dangerous and unconstitutional remedies proposed for their imitation and adoption, no matter how specious their exterior, which may lead to bloodshed and disunion, and will certainly end in anarchy and civil discord.§

We have now presented a brief synopsis of the resolves of the Legislatures of seventeen of the twenty-three States which, exclusive of South Carolina, then composed the Union. All these States, with perhaps the exception of Virginia, denounce, with more or less emphasis and severity, the nullifying proceedings of South Carolina, and approve

* State Papers, p. 214. † Id., 231. ‡ Id., 380. § Id., 222.

the proclamation of the President. We have not at hand the means of ascertaining what measures, if any, were adopted by the Legislatures of the other six States; but, when named, no one will doubt that the hearts of their people, even if their voices were silent, echoed the patriotic sentiments of the seventeen. They were Louisiana, whose sugar manufacturing interests were protected by the tariff, and whose chief city had been saved from capture and pillage by the strategy and heroism of the President; Missouri, a State which could gain nothing by nullification; Tennessee, the home of the President—a State which never faltered in fealty to him; Kentucky, the land of Henry Clay, who had, up to that time, been a Boanerges among the advocates of the protective system; Rhode Island, a manufacturing State, whose interests and principles were in favor of the system; and Vermont, always faithful to the Constitution and the Union. We may therefore safely assume that not one of the twenty-three States to which South Carolina addressed her labored justification, harbored a thought or uttered a whisper of approbation of her course. Indeed she complained, in some of her State Papers, that she was deserted by many to whom she had a right to look for succor and support. Slave States and Free States, Democratic States and Whig States, Southern States and Northern States, tariff States and anti-tariff States joined, "with one accord," in pronouncing against her an unhesitating sentence of condemnation. One would suppose that a decent respect for this solemn "verdict of her peers" would have induced the refractory State to pause in her mad career, and acquiesce, though it might be reluctantly, in the decision.

These proceedings of the State Legislatures have no direct bearing on the main question which we proposed to discuss in this review,—the question as to the manner in which, and the influences by which the nullification controversy was compromised; but they are interesting cotemporaneous documents relating to the subject, and we shall have occasion to refer to them again in another connection.

The ordinance of nullification reached President Jackson

early in December, and with his usual impulsive promptness, he issued his celebrated proclamation on the 10th of the same month. It was undoubtedly written by Edward Livingston, an able statesman, a profound jurist, an elegant writer, and this production is worthy of his fame. It is noble and patriotic in sentiment, powerful in language, and irresistible in argument. The greater part of it is as appropriate to our national exigencies now as it was then. It is too long for insertion here, and no extracts can give an adequate idea of its excellence. It contained an elaborate exposition of the President's views of the "Constitution and laws applicable to the measures adopted by the convention of South Carolina, and the reasons they have put forth to sustain them; declaring the course which duty would require him to pursue, and appealing to the understanding and patriotism of the people, to warn them of the consequences which must inevitably result from an observance of the dictates of the Convention." It passed in review the whole array of the pretexts and sophistries of the Convention. They fell before its majestic and triumphal march like grasshoppers beneath the tread of the elephant.

In the course of his argument, the President states his understanding of the issue tendered by South Carolina. "These," he says, "are the alternatives that are presented by the Convention. A repeal of all acts for raising revenue, leaving the government without the means of support, or an acquiescence in the dissolution of our Union by the secession of one of its members."*

The issue thus tendered is distinctly joined by the President. "This, then," he declares, "is the position in which we stand. A small majority of the citizens of one State have elected delegates to the State convention. That convention has ordained that all the revenue laws of the United States must be repealed, or that they are no longer a member of the Union. The Governor of that State has recommended to the Legislature the raising an army to carry the secession into effect." "It is the intent of this instrument to proclaim that the duty imposed on me by the Constitu-

* State Papers, p. 90.

tion to 'take care that the laws be faithfully executed,' shall in performed." "The laws of the United States must be executed. I have no discretionary power on the subject—my duty is emphatically pronounced in the Constitution."

From the decree of the Convention the President appeals, in tones of paternal tenderness, mingled with solemn remonstrance and minatory prophesy, to the people of South Carolina. "There is yet time," he says, "to show that the descendants of the Pinckneys, the Sumters, the Rutledges, and of the thousand other names which adorn the pages of your revolutionary history, will not abandon that Union, to support which so many of them fought, and bled, and died. I adjure you, as you honor their memory, as you love the cause of freedom to which they dedicated their lives, as you prize the peace of your country, the lives of its best citizens and your own fair fame, to retrace your steps. Snatch from the archives of your State the disorganizing edict of its Convention." "Tell its members that, compared with disunion, all other evils are light, because that brings with it an accumulation of all,—declare that you will never take the field unless the star-spangled flag of your country shall float over you—that you will not be stigmatized when dead, and dishonored and scorned while you live, as the authors of the first attack on the Constitution of your country! *Its destroyers you cannot be. You may disturb its peace—you may interrupt the course of its prosperity—you may cloud its reputation for stability, but its tranquility will be restored, its prosperity will return, and the stain upon its national character will be transferred and remain an eternal blot on the memory of those who caused the disorder.*"

We thus behold the State of South Carolina on the one side, and the United States on the other, standing face to face in antagonistic and defiant attitudes,—South Carolina in hostile array, with her nullifying ordinance, her palmetto flag and blue cockades, awaiting for what she called an assault on her liberty, independence and sovereignty;—and the United States, with the Constitution and laws of the Union in one hand, and in the other a sword to compel the rebellious State to obedience.

Did South Carolina cower under the weight of this proclamation—this club of Hercules—thus raised to smite her? Did she retreat from her perilous position? Not an inch. She abated not "one jot or tittle" of her requirements. She retracted nothing. On the contrary, she continued to hurl back her defiance with an apparent courage and firmness worthy of a better cause. She solicited no suspension of action on the part of the National Government. She made no overtures for negotiation. She stood on her assumed uncontrollable sovereignty, and would listen to no proposition short of a surrender of the whole matter in dispute—the total abandonment of the protective system. The Governor of the State issued a counter-proclamation, in which he openly defied the authority of the Executive of the Union. The Legislature passed a series of resolutions denying the constitutional authority of the President to issue his proclamation, charging him with giving utterance therein to his private feelings and retaliations, an unprecedented blending in a State paper of official and individual character, and an undisguised indulgence of personal hostility. The concluding resolve is, "That while this Legislature has witnessed with sorrow such a relaxation of the spirit of our institutions, that a President of the United States dares venture upon this high-handed measure, it regards with indignation, the menaces which are directed against it, and the concentration of a standing army on our borders; that the State will repel force by force and, relying on the blessing of God, will maintain its liberty at all hazards.* The Legislature also passed a number of acts in preparation for the impending conflict, one of which was, "An Act to provide for the security and protection of the people of the State of South Carolina." This Act authorizes the Governor to resist any attempt of the National Government to coerce the State into submission to the nullified Acts of Congress; and for that purpose to accept the services of such volunteers, and to call into service such portions of the militia as may be required. It also provides

* 12 Benton's Debates, p. 13.

for the organization of the militia and for the purchase of arms, ordnance and ammunition.*

The President, in a special message to Congress, of 11th January, 1833, thus states the dilemma in which the National Government was then placed: "If these measures cannot be defeated, the Constitution must be considered as incompetent to its own defence; the supremacy of the laws is at an end, and the rights and liberties of the citizens can no longer receive protection from the Government of the Union." In this emergency, what course did the Government pursue? It adopted a compromising, temporizing policy, on the recommendation of the same President; which, without extinguishing the fire, would merely postpone the eruption of the volcano to a then future, but now present time,—the evil time on which we have fallen,—a policy too much like that of a more recent "functionary" who paltered and compromised with known traitors to keep their parricidal swords in their scabbards until the expiration of his own term of office.

There could not be a more favorable opportunity than the one then presented, to settle effectually the question of supremacy between the Constitution and laws of the Union and those of the individual States by "wager of battle" which South Carolina thus tendered, and which seemed to have been joined by the President. The State stood alone. Not one of her sister States approved her course. The President's popularity was almost unbounded. General Scott was then in the full vigor of his manhood, and every throb of his heart was faithful and loyal, as it still is, to the Union. A detachment of military and naval forces had been sent to Charleston. A single vigorous blow would, in all human probability, not only have "put down" this act of rebellious nullification, but would have crushed, at once and forever, the spirit that prompted it. That blow was not struck.

Though the President's proclamation was so generally approved, there were, at the time, many misgivings and apprehensions that its threats would not be executed, and

* 12 Benton's Debates, pp. 16–17.

that the vigorous measures which it seemed to promise would be evaded or defeated. Many wise and sagacious statesmen who warmly approved its principles and spirit, and who were skilled to "discern the signs of the times," expressed their anxious forebodings on this subject. We quote, as an example, part of a letter from the late Judge Story, to a friend, dated 22d December, 1832: "The President's proclamation is excellent, and contains the true principles of the Constitution; but will he stand to it? Will he not surrender all to Virginia, who abhors all these principles? Will he not yield all which the South dictates, and sacrifice the North? Will not the Constitution be, as in times past, made for the benefit, and feelings, and interests of the South? I confess I have little belief that the South will be satisfied with any other course except that which surrenders up all the important interests of the non-slaveholding States. What pledge is there that they will not be surrendered?" * It was well known that there were malign influences in operation which justified these forebodings. Many strong motives existed to render the proclamation inoperative and to save South Carolina from the castigation which her rebellious arrogance richly merited. Some of the other slaveholding States were almost as bitterly opposed to the protective system as South Carolina. Though they condemned her revolutionary measures as unconstitutional, they were very willing to embrace any opportunity to abolish the system by legal means. Some of the non-slaveholding States also were opposed to the system; and many influential politicians were then, as now, in favor of concession and "peace at any price." Henry Clay, who had previously been an eloquent advocate of protection, lacked the necessary firmness to meet the emergency, and took the ground of concession. The President was himself unfriendly to the protective system, though he considered it Constitutional. He probably found, too, that in carrying out the purposes indicated in his proclamation, he would be obliged to rely quite as much on the aid of his general political adversaries as on his political partisans.

* Life and Letters of Joseph Story. Vol. ii., p. 115.

At least, he was very willing that Congress should take on itself a large share of the responsibility, and relieve him from a portion of the troubles and anxieties which the execution of those purposes involved. He was himself a slaveholder, a native of South Carolina and an adopted citizen of the slaveholding State of Tennessee. Under all these circumstances, it is not very strange that his sympathies should, to some extent, be with the South, while, at the same time, his indignation was roused by the threatened resistance of South Carolina to his official and personal authority.

Congress met on the 3d December, 1832, and we now come to the proof of our assertion that, substantially, all that nullification demanded was surrendered by Congress on the recommendation of Jackson himself. For this purpose we call him as our witness. "Though dead he yet speaketh" in his official state papers. His annual message to Congress was dated December 4th, 1832. He expatiates, at some length, on various matters touching our foreign and domestic affairs and relations, and then adverts to the subject of finance and revenue. He states, in substance, that on the 1st of January (then next), the whole public debt will be reduced to about seven millions of dollars, and that the means in the Treasury are ample to extinguish the whole within the year 1833. Among other suggestions, he says that the final removal of this great burden from our resources presents an occasion for further reduction of the revenue, and adds: "The subject is earnestly recommended to the consideration of Congress. The soundest maxims of policy," he proceeds to say, "require that the expenditure should be limited to what, by an economical administration, shall be necessary to an efficient public service" "*I recommend* that the *whole scheme of duties be reduced to the revenue standard.*" It will be here noted that the language of these recommendations is, almost literally, that of the Convention of South Carolina in stating their claims. The President then adverts to the protective system, and says that our experience "makes it doubtful whether the advantages of this system are not counterbalanced by many evils,

and whether it does not beget, in the minds of a large portion of our countrymen, a spirit of discontent and jealousy dangerous to the stability of the Union." "A large portion of the people in one section of the Republic declares it not only inexpedient," but "unconstitutional and unjust."

We have abridged this part of the message by omitting much of the verbiage and circumlocution usually found in public documents. We have endeavored to give a condensed but fair representation of the President's recommendations relating to the reduction of the revenue and the abandonment of the protective system, and we believe no one who reads them will fail to perceive their full and strict conformity with the demands of the nullifying Convention. The message may be found in vol. xii. of Benton's Abridgement of the Debates in Congress, page 3, *et sequentes.* See pages 6 and 7.

It might be sufficient to close this review by merely stating that Congress passed an Act embodying substantially the provisions recommended by the President and demanded by the South Carolina Convention. But certain facts and incidents occurred in the progress and final passage of the Act in Congress, and in the proceedings of the Convention on its acceptance, which are essential to the full and fair understanding of the history of the rise, progress and triumph of nullification, and which may be worth pondering in their relations to our present condition. We proceed, therefore, at the hazard of becoming tedious, to notice some of those facts and incidents.

In the House of Representatives, that part of the President's message which relates to the revision of the tariff was referred to the "Committee of Ways and Means," of which Mr. Verplanck, of New York, was Chairman. On the 27th of December, the Committee reported a bill to reduce and otherwise alter the duties on imports. But as this bill was afterwards amended by striking out all but the enacting clause, and substituting *verbatim* a bill which was introduced in the Senate by Mr. Clay, it is unnecessary to give a summary of Mr. Verplanck's bill.

On the 12th of February, 1833, Henry Clay, who had

been for many years a strenuous and eloquent advocate of the protective system, introduced his compromise bill. Its leading provisions were, a periodical annual reduction of one-tenth of the present duties for seven years, after which all the remaining duties above 20 per cent. on their value should be equally divided into two parts, one part to be struck off at the end of one year thereafter, and the other half at the end of another year, so that at the end of nine years, all duties should be reduced to 20 per cent. on the value, with a list of free articles; and no more revenue to be raised than necessary for the economical support of the Government. On the first introduction of this bill, Mr. Calhoun expressed his approval of its general principles, and promised to give it his support. He believed that if the present difficulties were to be adjusted, they must be adjusted on the principles embraced in this bill, of fixing *ad valorem* duties, except in few cases. He further stated that he would not vote for the prostration of the manufacturing interest. A very large capital had been invested in manufactures, and he would not give his vote to suddenly withdraw those duties by which that capital was sustained in the channel in which it had been directed.* It will appear, by the subsequent proceedings of the Convention, that these views of Mr. Calhoun were sanctioned by the Convention.

When Mr. Clay's bill was taken up for consideration in the Senate, he proposed an amendment, that after the period prescribed by the bill, all the duties should be assessed on a valuation made at the port in which the goods are first imported. This was opposed by Mr Calhoun, who declared that, according to his present impressions, the objections were insurmountable, and unless removed he should be obliged to vote against the whole bill. A side issue was thus raised which came near defeating the bill, but when the vote on the amendment was taken, finding that the bill could not pass without the amendment, and being desirous to save it, Mr. Calhoun and his friends voted in favor of the amendment as well as of the bill.

* Bent. Abr., vol. i., p. 84.

In the course of the debates in the Senate on the merits of the bill, Mr. Robbins, of Rhode Island, made an able speech against it, from which we quote a few warning and prophetic sentences: "It is said that the dissolution of the Union is threatened, and that this bill is necessary to hold the States together." "This very argument is what alarms me most as to the stability and efficiency of the Union. We have seen a State arm herself with this power" (of nullifying the laws of the National Government), "and put herself in an attitude to exert it. That State has neither disarmed herself nor renounced the power. Now we offer to her this bill to induce her, not to renounce this power, but to refrain from its exercise at present. Is not this a practical recognition of this power?" "If this precedent is to govern, where is the security for the stability of the Union? I cannot see. This bill, however, I suppose, is to pass." "If it does pass, it may smother the fire now raging in one place, but I fear it will preserve the embers that one day will consume the fabric of the Union."

In the House of Representatives the principal debate was on the bill introduced by Mr. Verplanck, but as the two bills were similar in principle, the arguments were generally applicable to both. We make some brief extracts from a few of the speeches to show the light in which the introduction and passage of the bill was viewed by some of the most enlightened and patriotic statesmen of that day.

Mr. Choate, of Massachusetts: "It is impossible for me to doubt the motive or object of this proceeding." "Why not avow it at once and put yourselves there upon the country? South Carolina has nullified your tariffs; and therefore you repeal them! You suppress nullification and take a statesmanlike pledge and guaranty against any future recurrence by any other State of that happy expedient, by just promptly granting, the first time you have a chance to act on it, all it demands." "There is but one ground on which you can account for the vote you give for this bill, and it is, that South Carolina has nullified every existing tariff."*

* Bent. Abr., vol. xii., p. 144.

Mr. Root, of New York, who advocated the bill, admitted that its origination, in the present session, was unquestionably owing to the organized opposition offered by one portion of the country against the collection of revenue under the tariff laws of 1828 and 1832. Unquestionably this bill before the house was introduced for the purposes recommended by the President, with a view to conciliate, if possible, our Southern brethren, and to induce them to stay their hand in opposing the laws.*

Mr. Appleton, of Massachusetts, at the close of an able financial argument against the bill, asks: "Does the South really wish the continuance of the Union?" "It may well be doubted whether certain leading politicians have not formed bright visions of a Southern Confederacy. This would seem to be the only rational ground for accounting for the movements in South Carolina. A Southern Confederacy, in which South Carolina should be the central State, and Charleston the Commercial Emporium, may present some temptations for individual ambition."†

John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts, considered that the question of nullification "was of such a nature that it ought to be settled. It ought to be known whether there are any measures by which a State could defeat the laws of the Union. If there were, and the laws might be set aside at pleasure, we must seek for some other form of government to live under." Mr. Adams, also, in his minority report, as a member of the "Committee on Manufactures," says: "The ground assumed by the South Carolina Convention for usurping the sovereign and limitless power of the people of that State to dictate the laws of the Union, and prostrate the legislative, executive and judicial authority of the United States, is as destitute of foundation as the forms and substance of their proceedings are arrogant, overbearing, tyrannical and oppressive." He declares his belief that "one particle of compromise with that usurped power, or of concession to its pretensions, would be a heavy calamity to the people of the whole Union, and to none more than to the people of South Carolina themselves;

* Benton's Abr., vol. xii. p. 152. † Id., p. 161.

that such concession would be a dereliction by Congress of their highest duties to their country, and directly lead to the final and irretrievable dissolution of the Union."*

Mr. Stewart, of Pennsylvania, after alluding to the numerous concessions which the North had made to appease the clamors of the South, adds: "They now demand that the protective principle shall be abandoned, or they will dissolve the Union." "Grant this, and next we must elect a President South of the Potomac, or we shall have another nullifying ordinance—more threats of civil war and bloodshed; and where is this system of concession to end? It will end only when all political power is surrendered to the South, and the people of the Northern and Middle States are reduced to a condition more miserable and degraded than that of the Southern slave. It is time to stop and tell these gentlemen plainly that we will go no further, and to play out their game of nullification if they dare."†

These specimens are sufficient for our present purpose, but I cannot forbear to quote a few passages from Mr. Webster's great speech in the Senate, in reply to Mr. Calhoun, in the debate on the revenue collection bill, commonly called the "Force Bill." While penning his words we seem to hear his solemn voice from the tomb, repeating, in thrilling tones, his denunciations, warnings and prophetic intuitions: "If the friends of nullification should be able to propagate their opinions, and give them practical effect, they would, in my judgment, prove themselves the most skilful 'architects of ruin,' the most effectual extinguishers of high-raised expectations, the greatest blasters of human hopes which any age has produced. They would stand up to proclaim, in tones which would pierce the ears of half the human race, that the last great experiment of representative Government had failed. They would send forth sounds, at the hearing of which, the doctrine of the divine right of kings would feel, even in its grave, a returning sensation of vitality and resuscitation. Millions of eyes of those who now feed their inherent love of liberty on the success of the American example, would turn away from

* Quincy's Life of Adams, p. 218. † Bent. Abr., p. 179.

our dismemberment, and find no place on earth whereon to rest their gratified sight. Amidst the incantations and orgies of nullification, secession, disunion and revolution, would be celebrated the funeral rites of constitutional and republican liberty." "I shall exert every faculty I possess in aiding to prevent the Constitution from being nullified, destroyed or impaired. And even should I see it fall, I will still, with a voice feeble, perhaps, but earnest as ever issued from human lips, and with fidelity and zeal which nothing shall extinguish, call on the PEOPLE to come to its rescue."*

Yes! troubled spirit, the People have come to the rescue, and the Constitution and Union are safe! Rest in peace!

We now turn to the consideration of the last act of this sad drama,—the subsequent proceedings of South Carolina. The act of humiliation on the part of the National Government is consummated. The Congress of the United States, at the earnest recommendation of the President, have concurred with the convention of South Carolina, in nullifying the same obnoxious Acts, not only in their application to South Carolina but to all the States and Territories of the Union. In what temper and spirit did South Carolina receive this oblation?

The Convention assembled to act on this subject on the 11th of March, 1833. The Compromise Act was referred to a select committee of twenty-one members, who made a report in a strain of complacent gratulations on the success which had rewarded their efforts, as well as on the courage, magnanimity and condescension of South Carolina. She had stood unmoved, firmly resolved to maintain her liberties, or perish in the conflict. The result has been a beneficial modification of the tariff of 1832, even before it took effect. Though the reduction provided for in the bill was not, either in amount or time, such as she had a right to require, yet she always had been willing to make large sacrifices to the peace and harmony of the Union. In a great struggle for principles, she would disdain to cavil about a

* Bent. Abr., vol. xii., p. 110.

small amount of duties, or a few years more or less in effecting the adjustment. The new bill is recommended to her acceptance because it establishes a system of *ad valorem* duties, and the entire abandonment of specific duties and *minimums*, and provides that the duties shall be eventually brought down to a revenue standard, and no more money shall be raised than shall be necessary to an economical administration of the government. The convention accordingly passed an ordinance declaring that their ordinance of November 24th, nullifying certain acts of Congress, should thenceforth be deemed and held to have no force or effect.* But though the first ordinance of nullification was thus nullified, the spirit that prompted it was not quieted, nor were its turbulent machinations even suspended.

In a message of the President sent in to Congress, subsequent to his annual message, he recommended the passage of a law to confer on the Executive more ample and larger powers te enforce the collection of duties in case of resistance. An Act, commonly called the "Force Bill," was accordingly passed, simultaneously with the passage of the compromise bill. The Convention referred this "Force Bill" also to a committee, who made a report which was adopted by the convention on the 18th March, 1833. In the course of their report the committee break forth into a song of triumphant and chivalric jubilation, in strains almost equal to those of Deborah when she and Barak had discomfited the hosts of Sisera. Listen! "The firmness of the State seems, at length, in some degree to have *triumphed.* But let it be recollected that the moment of triumph is commonly one of danger. Let it be kept in mind that this is not a contest ended, but a contest not more than begun .... Let it be carried on firmly, steadily, without passion and without faltering. If the vigilance of the State should relax; if it should cease to raise up barriers against the head of usurpation, which threatens to overwhelm us, the torrent will break loose and sweep our liberties along with it. Let every man consider this his own peculiar business. If liberty be saved, everything is saved. If liberty be lost, every-

* State Papers, p. 352.

thing is lost." "It is incumbent on South Carolina, unsupported as she is, to take care that no Federal authority, unauthorized by our Federal compact, shall be exercised within the limits of the State."* For the purpose of providing that the "Force Bill" shall never have operation within the limits of the State, the Committee recommended, and the Convention passed an ordinance declaring that the act of Congress, commonly called the "Force Bill," is, and shall be deemed "null and void within the limits of this State," and making it the duty of the Legislature to adopt such measures as may be necessary to prevent the enforcement thereof, and to inflict proper penalties on any person who shall do any act in execution or enforcement of the same within the limits of the State.†

THIS ORDINANCE NEVER WAS REPEALED, REVOKED OR MODIFIED!

And now, we would respectfully ask, Was nullification crushed—suppressed—"put down" by President Jackson or any one else, in 1833, or at any other time?

We have now given a sketch of the public history of the rise, progress and triumph of nullification in 1832–3. We have verified the material facts by reference to official and other cotemporaneous documents of unquestionable authenticity. The secret history of the intrigues, negotiations, threats, promises, aspirations, hopes, fears and other influences which governed the immediate actors in the drama, do not come within the scope of our present purpose. Those who feel an inclination to investigate those matters, so far as relates to the origin, progress and final passage of the compromise bill, may obtain "a peep behind the curtain" by consulting Benton's "Thirty Years' View," &c., vol. i., p. 340 *et seq.* We will quote a single paragraph, premising that the author was a devoted personal friend and political partizan of President Jackson:

"The act," he says, "of 1833, called a 'compromise,' was a breach of all the rules and all the principles of legislation—concocted out of doors, managed by politicians dominated by an outside interest—kept a secret—passed by a

* State Papers, p. 372. † Id. p. 372.

majority pledged to its support, and pledged against any amendment except from its managers,—and issuing from the conjunction of rival politicians who had lately and long been in the most violent state of legislative as well as political antagonism. It comprised every title necessary to stamp a vicious and reprehensible act—bad in the matter—foul in the manner—full of abuse—and carried through upon the terrors of some, the interests of others, the political calculations of many, and the dupery of more; and all upon a plea which was an outrage upon representative government—upon the actual government, and upon the people of the States."

Mr. Benton makes no allusion to the fact that his friend the President, earnestly recommended such a measure, but simply remarks that he "felt a positive relief in being spared the dire necessity of enforcing the laws by the sword and by criminal prosecution."

In reading the addresses and proceedings of the South Carolina Convention, it is amusing, though sad, to see how the lordlings of the assembly prate about the blessings of liberty and their love for it. "Inestimable are the blessings of the well-regulated freedom which permits MAN to direct his labors and his enterprise to the pursuit or branch of industry for which he conceives nature has qualified him, unmolested by avarice enthroned in power!" And this is the language of the slaveholders of South Carolina? they utter it with an apparently cool unconsciousness that a large majority of the MEN of that State were, at that moment, the bound victims of their own "avarice enthroned in power." Again: "We would infinitely prefer that the territory of the State should be the cemetery of freemen than the habitation of slaves!" At that moment the territory of the State was the habitation of 327,028 slaves,—of upwards of 60,000 more slaves than freemen! What a glaring specimen of infatuation! What a melancholy manifestation of the blindness of men to their own inconsistencies! Their love of freedom was not a generous, philanthropic love which would extend its blessings to universal humanity, but a selfish love of power under the assumed

name of liberty—a liberty to enslave, oppress and rule their fellow-men.

We have no disposition to intimate or suspect that the President was hypocritical or insincere in his professions of a determination to preserve the Union. We believe that if Congress had failed to pass the compromise bill, or if South Carolina had rejected it and persevered in her insurrectionary course, he would have executed his threatened measures of coercion and suppressed the insurrection by force. Our objection is, that almost immediately after issuing his noble proclamation, he yielded unconditionally, in his message to Congress, to the insolent, clamorous and arrogant demands of a traitorous foe, and thus, by a dereliction of his duty, transferred from his own hands and those of that generation, to his and their successors of the present generation, the task of vindicating the national supremacy. When prompt and energetic measures were required to crush not only the *act* but the *spirit* of insubordination and incipient rebellion, he urged upon Congress the adoption of a cringing and temporizing policy, which gave to the rebellious hosts all the fruits of a victory without even the hazards of a conflict. He knew, at that time,—no one knew better than he—that pacification thus purchased was a mere truce—a temporary suspension of hostilities. He knew that a dissolution of the Union was their ulterior object, the clamor about the tariff a mere pretext, and that slavery would be their next pretext. He prophetically announced this at the time; and that prophetic annunciation is now history. Under these circumstances it was wrong—morally and politically wrong—to adopt the temporizing, compromising policy which sacrifices future permanent good to present and transient ease and convenience. No generation has a moral right to relieve itself from present troubles by casting them, with new, accumulated and more complicated embarrassments, as an inherited curse, on a succeeding one. Each has enough of its own difficulties to encounter, and each should grapple with them and vanquish them as it best may. It is painful to dwell on the failings, mistakes and shortcomings of our fathers, but it is well to

heed them as warnings. We are now suffering in agony and sweat, and blood, and tears, the consequences of their mistake. May we, by our courage, perseverance and sacrifices save our children from similar calamities, and our Union from disintegration. May we thoroughly exorcise the foul spirit of treason from our land, give a death-blow to slavery—that moral and political upas whose poisonous exhalations are spreading desolation and threatening ruin, and thus transmit to our children an unencumbered inheritance of freedom, peace, prosperity and glory!

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 28.

THE DEATH OF SLAVERY.

LETTER FROM

PETER COOPER TO GOVERNOR SEYMOUR.

His Excellency Horatio Seymour, Governor of the State of New York:

My Dear Sir: I thank you for your prompt answer to my letter of 8th ult., and for the assurance I received that "we agree in the end to be realized, the restoration of the Union and the preservation of the Constitution."

So deeply am I impressed with the absolute necessity of maintaining the integrity of the Union and the Constitution, that I desire to see all the powers that God in nature has given us brought into requisition to save our country from being dissevered, and from becoming the sport of foreign and domestic Saracens. I fear we are in danger of being drawn into error by men who have no faith in a real democratic form of government—I mean a government that aims to secure the greatest good to all the people.

Being a democrat, nearly seventy-three years of age, and having served my country in person and by substitute from the commencement of the war with England to its close, I feel that I have right to plead with my countrymen of all the shades of political opinions, and to beseech them by every consideration that can move our manhood, to look with me at the dangers which threaten us as a nation.

One of the principal arguments made use of during the last

canvass to induce people to vote the democratic ticket, was the declaration in their platform and speeches, of the assurance that by such a vote they would obtain "a more vigorous prosecution of the war."

Since that time it has become common for those who sympathize with the South to profess great concern about the sovereignty of the individual states. Such persons fail to realize how entirely impossible it would have been for any one individual state to have gained an independence for itself. It required the united power and efforts of all the states to win and maintain an independence of the mother country.

It does now, it always has, and will forever, require the united powers of all the states, to hold securely the dear-bought treasure of freedom and independence—a treasure that should be the pride and glory of every American citizen. For men to talk about the sovereignty of an individual state that never had and never can have the power to win or maintain its sovereignty, is to talk of a living body without any animating spirit.

James Madison declared in the convention that formed the Constitution that "the states never possessed the essential right of sovereignty. These were always vested in Congress." He called the states great corporations. The folly of such an assumption of sovereignty was rendered apparent by the first attempt to form a government out of a league of states. Chancellor Kent assures us that "as soon as the league was ratified the states began to fail in a prompt and faithful obedience to its laws, and as danger receded instances of neglect became more frequent, and by the time of the peace of 1783 the disease of the government had displayed itself with alarming rapidity. The delinquencies of one state became the apology for those of another." He then declares that "the idea of supplying the pecuniary exigencies of the nation from requisitions on the states was soon found to be a delusion."

After a great deal had been said in the convention as to the rights of individual states, President Madison remarks: "I hope these arguments may convince all of the necessity of a strong energetic government, which will equally tend to give energy and protection to the state governments." He adds: "the object of the federation is twofold; first, to maintain the Union—

secondly, good government." "It is evident if we do not radically depart from the federal plan we shall share the fate of ancient and modern confederacies." Mr. Madison says, "Our greatest danger is from the encroachments of the states on the General Government." This apprehension is justly founded upon the experience of ancient confederacies, and ours is proof of it. He further says: "Our National Government must operate for the whole, and the people must have an interest in its support. But if you make the legislators subject and at the mercy of state governments, you ruin the fabric." "The weaker you make your confederacy the greater the danger." He cites evidences of this truth from the acts of the state governments too numerous to mention. It was his opinion, expressed at various times in the convention that framed the Constitution under which we live, that any thing less than such a yielding up of the powers of all the individual states, as would make a national government, would prove a phantom.

We are too apt to forget that the Constitution makes the duly elected President the commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, and holds him responsible for an energetic use of all the powers of the nation, to preserve its interests, its honor, and its life.

Nothing can be more certain than the fact that every effect, physical, moral, political, flows from a cause sufficient for its production. If the causes that now operate to spread misery, death, and desolation through the land are within our reach, there is nothing that can be more important for us than to understand and remove the causes that endanger all we hold dear.

Some may reply that we must stop the abolitionists from talking and writing, in order to prevent and remove dangers from our country; for these abolitionists are constantly declaring that "*these truths are self-evident, that all men are born equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.*" These abolitionists even go so far as to say, "That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men."

If it has been found impossible to restrain the few active abolitionists who were in the country when the war of rebellion was

commenced, what can we expect to accomplish when, by the course of events, they have been multiplied one hundred or a thousand fold?

Under these circumstances would it not be wise for us to take a lesson from Mahomet, who, when he found the mountain would not come to him, thought it best that he should go to the mountain?

Others will say that the President's proclamation of freedom and the Congressional act of confiscation must be withdrawn in order to remove the cause that continues the war. Such an opinion is without a shadow of authority from any act or from any member of the Confederate government.

In opposition to such an opinion I learn direct from Mr. Dean, the Provost-Marshal of St. Louis, that the proclamation of freedom has done more to weaken the rebellion than any other measure that could have been adopted. On his late visit to my house he informed me, that he had brought on a large number of rebel officers and men to be exchanged at Fortress Monroe. During their passage he took the opportunity to ask the officers in a body what effect the President's proclamation of freedom had produced in the South. Their reply was (to use their own vulgar mode of expression) that "it had played hell with them." Mr. Dean then asked them how that could be possible since the negroes cannot read. To which one of them replied that one of his negroes had told him of the proclamation five days before he heard it in any other way. Others said their negroes gave them their first information of the proclamation. One of these officers then said with a defiant air that if we would only leave them their corn, their bacon and their homespun, which their negroes produced, they would fight us twenty years. We cannot as a people too sincerely consider that old and worthy saying, that "a house divided against itself cannot stand."

It is undoubted that the proclamation did more to prevent foreign interference than all other measures.

Unfortunately for us, the seeds of a conflicting system were soon broadcast through our land by the unyielding policy of the mother country, acting in concert with mercenary men of our own, entirely regardless of human rights. Such a system has and

must continue to spread death and desolation through the land, until we are filled with our own ways, and become sick of our sins, and are made willing to do unto others as we would that others should do unto us. Just so long as we employ the power of the government to maintain, extend and perpetuate an institution that enables thousands to sell their own children to be enslaved, with all their posterity, just so long we must be a house divided against itself, with ruin staring us in the face. For slavery must forever be a war in its natural struggles for freedom, so long as God lights up the love of liberty in the human heart. The great question for the country is now to be settled by us—whether we will accept a providential interposition that has compelled the government, in the most reluctant self-defence, to declare freedom to all slaves claimed by rebels in arms, as the only effectual means of saving the nation's life, and thus performing the highest duty enjoined by the Constitution.

From all that can be gathered from the newspapers of the South that profess to speak in behalf of the states now in rebellion, we are compelled to believe that their Vice-President was in earnest when he declared that their intention was to make slavery the corner-stone of their confederacy. After the frightful loss of life and treasure already brought upon the nation, these men seem determined to wade through seas of blood in order to obtain stronger guarantees and additional protection for an institution which is at war with natural justice and all the noble instincts of a common humanity. When we are called upon to listen to the advocates of such a system, we would do well to bear in mind that men, in the opinion of Dr. Franklin, are proud, spirited little animals, not fit to be trusted with power. We should also profit by the warning of Jefferson, who said, (when speaking of the enslavement of human beings,) "when I remember that God is just, I tremble for my country." We, as a people, may well tremble for our country, when we fail to co-operate with events which have made the slave-owners of the South the grandest abolitionists of the nation. The people of the South, by making war for the destruction of the Union and Constitution, have made it necessary, right and proper, for the government to abolish slavery upon the same principle that it would be right to destroy a city in order to save a nation.

It is painful to find so many persons, whom we are compelled to respect for honesty of purpose, who, we are also compelled to believe, are as much in error as St. Paul was when he was hauling men, women and children to prison and death. I sincerely believe that ten years will not pass after the South obtains relief from the paralyzing and corrupting power of holding Africans in slavery with so large a portion of their own children in the same bondage, before they will erect monuments in honor of the deliverance from so great an evil. This opinion is confirmed by the actual experience of a gentleman now in this city, who, after having lived twenty-five years in the South, and having constantly employed hundreds of negroes, gives it as his unqualified opinion that the South would be enriched by the liberation of its slaves. He says the South has untold wealth within its reach which it never can obtain while it works men as slaves. This opinion is further confirmed by one of the largest sugar planters in the South. This gentleman, since the war was commenced, found one morning all his negroes surrounding his house, when one of them informed him that they had "'cluded to have wages after dis." Their master, after some parley, agreed to give them seven dollars per month, which they accepted and went to their work. This same master informed Judge Woodruff, of New Orleans, after getting in his crop, that he had never got it in so well and so cheaply before.

I believe it will be found that so soon as the South is secured to freedom, the colored people of the North will rapidly emigrate to the South and furnish an abundance of cheap labor of all kinds.

I have written this long letter because I fear that errors, however honestly entertained, have been and will continue to be the means of stimulating the rebels to persevere in their efforts for our destruction. The sympathy manifested for the rebellion by men throughout the North, and the constant opposition to the course adopted by our Administration, may enable the rebels to draw foreign governments to their aid, and in that way bring unheard-of suffering upon our country.

I do not know a single man in the whole nation who has the power to do so much to strengthen the hands of the government as yourself. Your efforts may prevent foreign interference in

our affairs, and enable our government the sooner to bring the rebellion to an end. The influence you can exert would do an immense amount of good by persuading our democratic friends to give their whole strength to a "more vigorous prosecution of the war."

I believe it would be the proudest day of your life, if I could induce you to call on all, without distinction of party, to unite to conquer the rebellion, relying that all reasonable sympathy and kindness will be manifested to the people of the South by the people of the North, when they see that the rebels have laid down their arms and have shown a determination to become peaceable citizens of a united country.

I have written these long letters with an inexpressible desire to do what I can to restore peace and prosperity to our suffering country—a country that, in the course of nature, I shall soon leave; but with an ardent hope that it may forever remain a glorious Union of states, where goodness and greatness shall be the motto and inspiration of the people.

Yours, most respectfully,

PETER COOPER.

New York, September 22, 1863.

☞ *Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No.* 863 *Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.*

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 29.

SLAVERY, PLANTATIONS, AND THE YEOMANRY.

A PORTION of a work, published some years ago by Mr. Joseph Kay, in England, has recently been republished in America, under the title, "Social Condition and Education of the People of England," containing the results of the official inquiries made by Mr. Kay as royal commissioner. The book, as issued here, forms a duodecimo volume of some three hundred pages, and ought to be in the hands of every thinking American at the present period of our heaving struggle. It does not only deserve the reflecting attention of the statesman, the law-maker, and the philosophical student of history, but it seems that its pages ought to be carefully read by every earnest and conscious participator in our great institutions, especially now, when the time approaches nearer and nearer, which will demand of us the gravest task—the reconstruction of the Union: a task which cannot be performed by the repetition of some stereotyped phrase or other, such as "The Union as it was, and the Constitution as it is." No great task in history has ever been performed—no serious difficulty, even in the individual lives of men, can ever be solved—by the repeti-

tion of verbal formulas, stale or new. Revolving repetition imparts no efficacy to the Buddhist prayer; and those whom Cicero called the "chanters of formulas" are not the saviors of their countries. Integrity, resolution, and wisdom, are the elements of great acts in grave times, and wisdom may be learned on some points from the work just mentioned.*

One of the most potent and appalling truths presented and proved beyond all contradiction in Mr. Kay's work, is the hopelessly abject state of the British peasantry, caused by the extinction of the class of small farmers and comfortable freeholders, through the ever-enlarging estates of the few landholders. The Romans had a word for the overgrown possessions of land-owners—they called them *latifundia;* and to such an enormous extent have these *latifundia* grown in England and Wales, and consequently to so small a number have the possessors of land in that country been reduced, that the London Spectator, of July 11, 1863, could publish, as a supplementary sheet, a sadly instructive map, on which the districts owned by the different families, with the names of the latter, are laid down, as provinces and counties are on common maps. There are maps of whole countries, or portions of the globe, which exhibit the different races, or the products, or the languages, or the currents of the atmosphere; there are geological maps; but never before has it been possible to publish a map of land-owners, representing an entire modern kingdom, on a sheet of moderate size. It would have been possi-

* Letters, now publishing in the London "Star" newspaper, confirm, with distressing force of details, all that Mr. Kay, as royal commissioner, has stated in the mentioned work.

ble to present such a map of Italy in her worst imperial times, and of some European countries in the darkest Middle Ages.

Between these British landowners and the vast ignorant, immoral, pauperized, and dangerous peasantry, there is, according to Mr. Kay, nothing but "an impassable gulf." No hale and hardy yeoman ploughs any longer there his glebe. The yeomanry in England are extinct. Mr. Kay shows sufficiently how this state of things has come about, and why the English peasantry stands now, in every point of view, physical and moral, below the peasantry of any other country of Central Europe where the feudal tenure of land has been abolished.

Now, I take it that all history establishes, and all profound statesmen and publicists acknowledge, the following two facts, namely:

A numerous and independent yeomanry—that is to say, a large class of fairly schooled, intelligent, and respectable freeholders, of moderate, yet sufficient estate—spread over the country, with an honorable share in its government, constitutes one of the most important elements of a healthful state of a nation, and is wholly indispensable to a people whose type of government is that of substantial and orderly freedom, most especially so at a period which Vaughan has properly called the Age of Large Cities. The tranquillity of the farmer must counteract the restless and reckless portions of city populations.

Secondly, wherever permanent, large and compact estates exist, whether we call them *latifundia* or plantations, a yeomanry cannot exist by the side of them. Huge estates always tend to the buying out of the small farmer, and to reducing him to poverty; for the interest of

the money he may obtain for his farm is insufficient to support him and his family as his farm did. Let a comfortable farmer of several hundred acres, well stocked too, sell his estate, and he is a poor man at once.

These are not recently discovered truths. It is now acknowledged that Gracchus did not desire to uproot Roman society by his agrarian laws. He saw the fearful fact before him, that the possessors of the *latifundia* were enlarging their possessions more and more, were buying out the independent Roman farmer, once the very substance of the state, but who, ousted by the senatorial landholder, went to the city, there to swell the worthless, idle, and clamorous population which played so calamitous a part in later Roman history, down to the breaking up of the Empire. Gracchus saw that the *latifundium*-holders were gradually substituting slaves, imported from Greece and Asia, for the free farmer, and, because thus substituting slaves, were turning the fertile grain-growing Italy into a merely grazing country, since the slave is unfit for minute and careful agriculture. Gracchus showed this threatening and demoralizing state of things, presented the yeoman as the sinew of a manly country, and desired for the ousted cultivator nothing more than a portion of the public land which the big landholders had arrogated to themselves, often by no other means, probably, than by fencing and afterwards claiming it as their own. I have seen a similar process of land arrogation by boldly fencing it in, in this country, though on a smaller scale than it was carried on in Italy, where the conquered always lost a large portion, at times the whole, of their land. The *latifundium*-holders and land-thieves were enraged against Gracchus, made a statesman-martyr of him, and blasted

his fame for many long centuries, until truth was made to shine again, and Gracchus was at length restored.

In the southern portion of our country the increasing extent of plantations, the ousting of the yeoman, the pauperizing and degradation of the ousted farmer, if he did not emigrate, has shown itself, as in England and in ancient Italy; with this difference, that in the latter countries the landholders were, or are connected with a landed aristocracy, while with us the far greater portion of the owners of plantations are successful adventurers, very frequently former overseers, or men who have made a fortune as merchants, tradespeople, or lawyers. No feudal law promotes the land-devouring tendency with us, but THE INSTITUTION OF SLAVERY TAKES ITS PLACE. Slavery is unfit for small farming, and profitable only if used for the cultivation of simple staples on a large scale, so that slavery leads to large accumulations of landed property, and keeps them together, although the owning family may change every generation.

When, more than thirty years ago, the writer of these remarks went to the South, a distinguished person of South Carolina—not Petigru, but a thorough Southerner in every way—expressed himself as sadly and as fearfully of the future, as Gracchus can ever have done, to a friend, on the incompatibleness of large plantations with neighboring farms, and of their uniform tendency to destroy the yeoman; while he spoke of the degraded condition of the poor white man by the side of the cotton *latifundia*, almost as keenly as Kay speaks of the vileness of the British peasantry.

The American case is worse than the English in this, that however injuriously the British law of primogeniture

works, by bringing whole districts into the hands of a few, it creates at any rate an acknowledged aristocracy, with some redeeming qualities, while in America the large plantation is kept together by the necessity inherent in slavery, and the *latifundium* shifts from *parvenu* to *parvenu*, using his station and power as a larger landowner for turbulent arrogance, unrestrained by the traditions of family or of the whole society, often even unrestricted by some sort of public opinion. Public opinion—far the most efficient of those powers which keep us on the main road of morality—can exist in districts only which are fairly peopled by homogeneous men; but the large planter, with his two or three hundred slaves, is isolated with his absolute power.

Governor Adams, in his famous message to the Legislature of South Carolina, recommending the reopening of the African slave-trade, in spite of constitution and law, mentions, indeed, the condition of the poor men as one of his reasons for doing so. He did not, however, desire to re-establish a yeomanry. The reason which he gave for proposing the revival of the iniquitous traffic, was, that the high price of slaves made it impossible for the less wealthy classes to possess any, and that thus a dangerous class of men, without direct interest in slavery, was springing up. By reopening the slave trade, negroes should be made so cheap that every white man might be made an interested shareholder in the institution. This message was sent to the legislature about two years before secession broke out, and shortly before, Africans were actually imported again into South Carolina.

Slavery undermines the ground in all directions, as the burrowing creatures of the West make the prairie unsafe

for hunter and team. The small and respectable freeholder is indispensable to the cohesion and permanency of our country. Slavery is incompatible with such yeomanry. What is the natural conclusion? Shall we, reconstructing our political system, sacrifice the country and its existence as the abode of a free nation, to a few land-and-men-holders, or shall we accept, calmly and wisely, the effects and consequences already brought forth by this civil war of almost unmitigated criminality? The war was forced upon us; and shall we not allow the extinction of slavery, or at least the most stringent possible compression of slavery, fixing its utter expiration at no distant period, to be forced upon us likewise?

Slavery is, in this point of social economy, as in every other respect, a disturbing element—a splinter in the foot of fair America, destined still to travel high roads and long. Shall we not extract the inflaming thorn, when it may be well said a far better opportunity is vouchsafed to us than the most sagacious could have foreseen, or the most sanguine could have hoped for—when a great civil war has freed us, and we may act on a scale as large as the war, or as energetically as the wickedness of the rebellion?

Leave aside all considerations of morality, religion, right, and consistency; dismiss even the question of common profit—the reconstruction of the Union alone demands, were it even exclusively upon the ground of an intelligent and patriotic statesmanship, the soonest possible elimination of this estranging and fevering institution. Or are we not in sacred duty bound to reconstruct the Union? Or, if bound to do so, are we, perchance, to restablish the Union as it was before the outbreak of the

rebellion ? If we should wish to do so, reality and facts, altered circumstances and final changes, would make it impossible ; and if it were possible, and we were desirous of doing so, we should be no wiser than a man whose house has tumbled about his ears, who should insist upon rebuilding it exactly as it had been—each joist, each rafter, where it was ; each unresisted pressure, each unsupported weight, each wall without buttress, as they were before the crumbling of the walls. Those who expect us to do this thing must believe us nearly demented, or they themselves must be closely approaching to that state of mind. They have taken, it seems, for their motto, The Union as it was, the Constitution as it is. A fitter sentiment would be, The Country as it was, the Union ten times better.

Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals, may obtain any of our publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No. 863 Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 30.

REBEL CONDITIONS OF PEACE

AND

THE MECHANICS OF THE SOUTH.

The spirit which animates the leaders of the southern rebellion, and the abject condition to which the despotism they have established in the southern territory, which still remains subject to their rule, has reduced the people of the South, are portrayed in the following articles from the Richmond *Enquirer*, entitled "Peace," and the "Mechanics of the South." The free and intelligent people of the Northern States will do well to read and ponder upon the conditions which these haughty oligarchs propose to the free Demoracy of America.

"They have learned nothing, and forgotten nothing," and with Maryland, Missouri, Tennesseee, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Mississippi, wrested from their unholy grasp, and their Minister Mason, retiring in disgust from the doorways of the British Minister, whose anti-chambers have been steadily and constantly closed to his entreaties, they still imagine themselves, if not the masters of the world, at least the arbiters of American destinies.

The result of their schemes is shown in the miserable condition to which they have reduced their misguided, deluded and betrayed people, and the mechanics of the North can plainly see what their fate would be should the rebel hopes of success be fulfilled.

Fortunately the present position of their affairs gives neither warrant to their hopes, nor reason for their insolence.

REBEL CONDITIONS OF PEACE.

From the Richmond Enquirier of October 16, 1863:

"PEACE."

"Save on our own terms, we can accept no peace whatever, and must fight till doomsday, rather than yield an iota of them, and our terms are:

Recognition by the enemy of the independence of the Confederate States.

Withdrawal of the Yankee forces from every foot of Confederate ground, including Kentucky and Missouri.

Withdrawal of the Yankee soldiers from Maryland, until that State shall decide, by a free vote, whether she shall remain in the old Union, or ask admission into the Confederacy.

Consent, on the part of the Federal Government, to give up to the Confederacy its proportion of the navy as it stood at the time of secession, or to pay for the same.

Yielding up of all pretension, on the part of the Federal Government, to that portion of the old Territories which lies west of the Confederate States.

An equitable settlement on the basis of our absolute independence and equal rights of all accounts of the public debt and public lands, and the advantages accruing from foreign treaties.

These provisions, we apprehend, comprise the minimum of what we must require before we lay down our arms. That is to say, the North must yield all,—we nothing. The whole pretension of that country to prevent, by force, the separation of the States must be abandoned, which will be equivalent to an avowal that our enemies were wrong from the first; and, of course, as they waged a causeless and wicked war upon us, they ought, in strict justice, to be required, according to usage in such cases, to reimburse to us the whole of our expenses and losses in the course of that war. Whether this last proviso is to be insisted upon or not, certain we are that we cannot have any peace at all, until we shall be in a position, not only to demand and exact, but also to enforce and collect treasure for our own reimbursement out of the wealthy cities in the enemy's country. In other words, unless we can destroy or scatter their armies, and break up their Government, we can have no peace; and if we can do that, then we ought not only to extort from them our own full terms and ample acknowledgment of their wrong, but also a handsome indemnity for the trouble and expense caused to us by their crime.

Now, we are not yet in position to dictate those terms to our enemies, with Rosecrans' army still in the heart of our country, and Meade still on Virginia soil, but though it is too soon to propose such conditions to them, yet it is important that we should keep them plainly before our own eyes as the only ad-

missible basis of any conceivable peace. This well fixed in the Confederate mind, there will be no more fearful looking for news from Europe, as if that blessed peace were to come to us over the sea, and not to be conquered on our own ground. There will be no more gaping for hints of recognition and filling of the belly with the East wind; no more distraction or diversion from the single momentous business of bracing up every nerve and sinew of the country for battle.

It is especially now, at the moment when great and perhaps decisive battles are impending at two or three points, that we think it most essential to insist upon the grand and entire magnificence of the stake and cause.

Once more we say it is all or nothing. This Confederacy or the Yankee nation, one or other, goes down, down to perdition. That is to say, one or the other must forfeit its national existence and lie at the mercy of its mortal enemy.

We all know by this time the fate in store for us if we succumb. The other party has no smaller stake.

As surely as we completely ruin their armies—and without that is no peace nor truce at all—so surely shall we make them pay our war debt, though we wring it out of their hearts. And they know it well, and, therefore, thep cannot make peace except through their utter exhaustion and absolute inability to strike another blow.

The stake they have to forfeit, then, if they lose this dreadful game, is as vital as ours. So is the stake to be won if they win anything. It is no less than the entire possession of our whole country, with us in it, and everything that is ours, from Ohio to the Rio Grande, to have and to hold, to them and their heirs forever.

But, on the other hand, what we mean to win is utter separation from them for all time. We do not want to govern their country, but after levying upon it what seemeth good to us by way of indemnity, we leave it to commence its political life again from the beginning, hoping that the lesson may have made them sadder and wiser Yankees.

We shut them out forever, with all their unclean and scoundrelly ways, intending to lead our lives here in our own Confederate way, within our own well-guarded bounds, and without, as St. John says, are dogs.

And let no Confederate feeble knees and tremulous backbone say to us, this complete triumph is impossible; say that we must be content with some kind of compromise, and give and take; on the contrary, we must gain all or lose all, and that the Confederates will indeed win the giant game, we take to be as certain as any future event in this uncertain world.

Meade's army and Rosecrans' once scattered, Lincoln can get no more armies. The draft turns out manifestly fruitless. Both the German and Irish element are now for peace. The Yankees have to bear the brunt of the war themselves, but in the meantime their inevitable bankruptcy is advancing like an

armed man. Hungry ruin has them in the wind. It cannot be long before the Cabinet of Washington will have, indeed, to consider seriously proposals for peace, under auspices and circumstances very different from the present. For the present the war rolls and thunders on, and may God defend the right."

THE MECHANICS OF THE SOUTH.

Abject Posture of Labor and Laborers.

The Richmond *Examiner*, of the 12th inst., says: That on Saturday, the 10th inst., a very large and spontaneous meeting of the mechanics and working men of Richmond was held to consider their interests, and obtain a free expression of the sentiments of the people generally.

From the resolutions passed, we select the two following:

Resolved, *That awakened to a sense of the abject posture to which labor and we who labor have been reduced*, and to the privileges, which as citizens and people, the Institutions of our Country vest in us, *we will not sleep again until our grasp has firmly clenched the rights and immunities which are ours as Americans and men: until our just demands have been met by the concessions of all opposing elements.*

Resolved, That it is the duty of the Government to take care of the unfortunate, and not the rich.

The *Enquirer* is extremely indignant at this assemblage, and deals with the "working men" in the following fashion:

"The mechanics of Richmond enjoy all the 'rights and immunities' that any and every other man enjoys, *and they will not be permitted to 'grasp' or 'clench' any more.* We hope the Legislature of Virginia will not permit itself to be influenced by such minatory resolutions, to pass a law forbidden by the experience of all history, and opposed by the teachings of every public economist, and which is now opposed by some of the ablest and wisest men of their own body. The men who compose the armies of the Confederacy have, for the last two years, permitted all their 'rights and immunities' to be most materially circumscribed, their 'privileges' reduced to the one high and holy privilege of shooting and being shot for their country. These men, without shoes, blankets, provisions—in want, and suffering with wounds, and even unto death, have nobly and gallantly borne all these hardships, unmurmuring and uncomplaining, Upon what are these sleepless resolutionists to fix their 'grasps?' We leave the Governor and Mayor to answer these questions, and to interpret these resolutions, *and to decide what their respective duties may be when the 'grasping' and 'clenching' begins.*

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 31.

ADDRESS

OF THE LOYAL LEAGUES OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK TO THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

Convention assembled at Utica, Oct. 20, 1863.

The delegates of the Leagues of the State of New York, assembled in the city of Utica, October 20, 1863, to consider in what manner they may best aid the Government in the prosecution of the war to the final and complete overthrow of the rebellion against its authority, and the re-establishment of the national unity, have, after much deliberation, come to the following conclusions :

1. One of the ways in which you can "best aid" it, is to talk and write against the Rebellion. The sham Democrats talk and write a little against it. But this is only to the end of making more effective their much talking and writing for it. In your honest, earnest, and habitual talking and writing against the Rebellion, you should especially aim to arouse the slumbering patriotism of your neighbors. Especially also should you aim, if only for their children's sake, to recall to loyalty such of those neighbors as have followed the counsels of treason. Very sad is the reflection that thousands of persons here at the North must go through life under the stigma of being the children of traitors.

2. Another of the ways in which you can "best aid" your Government, is with your money. Welcome the war taxes, even the heaviest of them, upon your property and pursuits, pay them patriotically and cheerfully. Have you money to invest?—purchase with it the bonds of the Government. For in this wise you not only help the Government with your money, but you also help it by expressing your confidence in it. Doubt not that these bonds will be paid. No other nation has more ability than our own to

fulfill its obligations. But to a patriot this point need not be argued. For he wishes no higher than his country's security for the return of his investment. If his country fail, he is willing to fail with it. Wealth can no longer have worth to him, after he no longer has a country.

3. Another of the ways in which you can "best aid" your Government is to supply it with soldiers. When one of your drafted neighbors can not or ought not to be a soldier, then let a substitute be provided. Men of property, and especially rich men, should be eager to help make such provision. What so good use can a man make of his wealth as in obtaining defenders of his country? The present call of the Government for three hundred thousand soldiers you should not only approve but rejoice in. It is a fresh evidence not only of the earnestness of the Government, but of its determination to make a speedy end of what remains of the Rebellion. We hope that no draft will be necessary, but that three hundred thousand volunteers will respond to the call, and that their neighbors will encourage them with liberal bounties and ample provision for their families.

4. The only other, of all other ways, to best aid your government, which we will single out and commend to you, is that of giving your votes, and of getting other men to give theirs, to the Government. The civil as well as the military power must be on the side of the Government. If you give the Government all that it needs of military preparation against the enemy, including even millions of soldiers, nevertheless, with an adverse civil power, it will be but too like to fail. Hardly could you hope for success for it, if the National Legislature, or a large proportion of the State Legislature or State Executive were against it. Suppose Gov. Curtin of Pennsylvania, and Gov. Andrew of Massachusetts, had been at work with our Gov. Seymour to poison and prejudice the popular mind against the Government. Suppose that, like him, they had refused to protect with State troops the peace, the persons, and the property of their respective States; suppose that, like him, they had put the militia of their respective States in the hands of officers who are notoriously in sympathy with the enemy; suppose that, like him, they had desecrated the Fourth of July with speeches inciting their followers to violence against the Government, and to the putting of mobs on a par with the Government, and to the accounting of the Government as a despotism

which they are at liberty to supplant with a despotism of their own choosing, and to the classing of Northern traitors with our Revolutionary Fathers, and to the shutting of Federal power out of the States; to suppose all this is to suppose that the Government would surely have been discouraged and paralyzed, and the country surely lost.

We are urging the importance of votes for the Government—in other words, of votes that will place the Civil Authorities on the side of the Government. This importance is even greater than that of giving soldiers to the Government. With the Civil Authorities on its side, the Government will find it easy to get soldiers. But, with the Civil Authorities at work to reduce the patriotism of the people, and turn them away from the war, the obstacles in the way of getting soldiers will become well nigh insurmountable.

But how shall we so give our votes, that they will be votes given to the government? We answer by electing men to office who, officially and unofficially, formally and informally, in season and out of season, constantly and cordially, will co-operate with the Government in its one present work of crushing the rebellion! Hence if there is a candidate, who does not make this work earnestly and unconditionally his own one present work, we can not vote for him. When a sound patriot sees a causeless and murderous rebellion against his country he does not, like Gov. Seymour, "PAUSE" to make conditions. But he goes promptly and unqualifiedly for putting it down, wholly irrespective of what the putting of it down may help or harm. We can put political power into no man's hands, who, when the life of his country is struck at, will not go instantly, uncalculatingly, and unconditionally for overthrowing the assassins. And just now let us say, that if any man has a party or an interest which will be damaged by the putting down of this rebellion, he had better hasten to quit the party and dismiss the interest. For they must both be bad, very bad.

In the light of what we have said, we can not vote for any of the candidates on the Democratic State ticket; for not one of them is in favor of putting down the rebellion unconditionally, and by whatever means may prove most effective. Not one of them stands by the Government. All of them stand by Seymour, Vallandigham, and others, open enemies of the Government. All of them are for making peace with the rebels by making concessions

to the rebels. To vote for them is to vote for men in open sympathy with the enemy, and for men whom the enemy is intensely and openly desirous to have us elect.

And now can we, in the light of what we have laid down, vote for the men on the other State ticket—the Union State ticket? We can. We can vote for every one of them. There are Democrats upon it, and yet Republicans can vote the ticket. There are Republicans upon it, and yet Democrats can vote it. In short, any and every man can vote it, who is not more of a partisan than a patriot. And why is it that every patriot can vote it? Because every man upon the ticket is a patriot, and goes therefore for the destruction of the rebellion, at whatever cost to party or self. Because, in a word, every man upon it has given up party and self for country.

We might have summed up all the duties that we owe at this crisis, in the one duty of standing by our patriotic Government, and especially by our able and honest President.

We say no more. The time for words is passing away. The time for duty is at hand. In a few hours we shall start for our respective homes, and for the renewal of our labors to get patriotic votes into the ballot box. We trust that you will all be with us in this labor; and that you will count no services too burdensome, if so be that you may thereby contribute to make the labor successful.—Pennsylvania and Ohio have just proved, through the ballot box, that they are on the side of the country. In the like way must New York prove that she also is on that side. The union of these three great centre States will, to use Bible language, be "a threefold cord not quickly broken."—This cord will stand any strain which the traitors of the South or the worse traitors of the North can bring against it.

Ohio has put her Vallandigham into his political grave. Pennsylvania has put her Woodward into his. A fortnight hence, and New York will make a similar disposition of her Seymour and Woods. It is true, that they are not literally in nomination at this election. Nevertheless their principles, and virtually they themselves, are in nomination in the persons of the Democratic State candidates.—Hence, in burying these candidates, *as we surely shall*, we shall also bury the Seymours and Woods, whose traitorous principles are identical with and more outspoken than those of these candidates.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 32.

WAR POWER OF THE PRESIDENT—SUMMARY IMPRISONMENT—HABEAS CORPUS.

THE Constitution of the United States establishes a GOVERNMENT, and not a confederacy or compact merely. This is obvious from the facts that it institutes all the essentials of governmental power: a legislature, an executive, and a judiciary; and that these powers are independent of, and superior to, the several state legislative, executive, and judicial powers; so that we have an independent self-existent government. It matters not that it is constitutionally limited in its purposes, it is, within its constitutional sphere of action, as perfect a sovereignty as any government on the face of the earth; for, "this constitution, and all laws of the United States, which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding;" and, "the judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made or which shall be made under their authority;" and, "the senators and representatives before-mentioned, and the members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution."

We have, then, a National Government comprising a legislature, invested with certain specified law-making powers; an executive, to see that the laws are faithfully executed; and a judiciary to maintain all the legitimate powers of the government intact.

And in its territorial jurisdiction, this government is co-extensive with the thirty-four states of the Union, and all other territory thereunto belonging. And it was established in perpetuity; all its powers were *given, granted, and conveyed* forever, save so far as they may, from time to time, be amended in the way prescribed in the Constitution. Constitutionally, then, this government is perpetual. It has a right to live in the plenitude of its power, and the integrity of its territorial sovereignty. And this right of life and perpetuity is necessarily a primary and fundamental constitutional principle—paramount to everything else. Every specific provision of the Constitution is as obviously subordinate to it as if a clause to that effect were plainly written down, for the continued life of the government is the indispensable basis upon which the entire Constitution rests.

Assuming, then, the controlling principle of the Constitution to be, that the government and the Constitution itself *shall live*, it is self-evident, that this same controlling principle carries with it all the needful power to protect and defend the government in all its political and territorial sovereignty; so that there is *somewhere* in the government a constitutional power to resist and suppress a rebellion, limited only by the necessity of the case; power unlimited to use any and all means necessary or expedient to suppress it; power to put everything out of the way that in any manner, or in any degree, endangers the life of the government.

We say this principle flows naturally from the right of the government to live; and we may go a step farther, and trace it to a still deeper source in the constitutional fountain; to the constitutional fact that we have a government. For without this principle, it cannot be said that the government has really a right to live; without it, any portion of the people could destroy the government at will; and without the right to live, what we have been in the habit of calling a government, is really no government at all. If we have a rightful government, that government has a right to live; if it has a right to live, it has a right to defend itself against rebellion; and if it has a right to defend itself, it has a right to use all needful means for that purpose. If it has not the right thus to defend itself, the rebels have the right to destroy it; for it cannot be wrong to destroy it, and also wrong to defend it. I cannot comprehend the Buchanan doctrine, that the rebels have not the right to destroy the government, and that the government has not the right to resist them. It makes the Constitution a jumble. It makes it mean neither one thing nor the other,

and puts sovereignty nowhere. Rejecting this mysterious doctrine, therefore, we must admit, either the unlimited right of the government to defend itself, or the right of the South to break up the government. There is no middle ground.

This brief deduction of constitutional principles, conclusive in itself as it seems to be, is specifically endorsed and confirmed by this clause of the Constitution:

"Before he enters on the execution of his office, he shall take the following oath or affirmation: I do solemnly swear (or affirm), that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States."

This clause commands the Constitution to be preserved, protected, and defended, *not* conditionally, not in any particular manner, not by any limited means, and not in subordination to the dicta of judges or anybody else; but *to the full extent of the President's ability*. This language sounds very much as if the first object of the Constitution is to preserve and perpetuate itself. Paramount to everything else, it shall be preserved, protected, and defended. Such is the palpable import of the language. Now, to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution, it is indispensable that this rebellion shall be suppressed; so that this clause plainly and unequivocally requires and commands that the rebellion shall be put down by any efficient and necessary means whatever. And it constitutes and appoints the President the chief agent of the nation to do this work. It swears him to do it to the best of his ability, while it does not require any other man to be so sworn. Other officers are sworn simply to *support* the Constitution—*he* is sworn to *preserve, protect, and defend* it. To support the Constitution is to uphold it by our ordinary influence and not oppose it; to preserve, protect, and defend it to the best of one's ability, is to seek out its enemies who make war upon it, and their aids and comforters, and put them down.

Constitutionally appointed commander-in chief, for this purpose, too, the President is the embodiment of the unlimited national sovereignty for the active work of preserving, protecting, and defending the Constitution; in other words, for suppressing rebellion. Whatever the nation has a right to do in this behalf, he is the lawful agent to do, with all the material means placed at his command by Congress. Therefore, the Constitution is imperative that he shall suppress this rebellion by any and all needful measures, to the best of his

ability. He is not only the commander-in-chief of the army in the field and the navy on the waters, but the special conservator of the Constitution in all respects, with jurisdiction co-extensive with the whole Union. His power in this behalf reaches Maine and Minnesota, as well as Virginia and Carolina.

Tell me now, ye croakers for "the Constitution as it is," why it is that the President may lawfully shoot down our own citizens in rebel armies, or imprison them, or destroy towns and cities and other property, "without due process of law," in the face of the plain constitutional provision, for which you clamor so long and so loudly, that "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." It is because the Constitution is not a self-destroying instrument; because no part of it was designed to aid traitors in the unholy work of destroying the whole; because there is nothing in it calculated to hinder or obstruct the work of maintaining it as the supreme law of the land; because that and all kindred provisions are subordinate to the great fundamental principle of the right of the government to live and defend itself against all perils; because this principle obviously implies that every specific provision of the Constitution shall be construed consistently with the amplest right of the government to suppress rebellion by all needful means; and because the government, having the right to live, has the correlative right to use sufficient means to preserve its own life, precisely as an individual has the right to defend his life by any necessary means, even to taking the life of an assailant.

If all this be sound constitutional law, it follows, necessarily, that, in the execution of the great trust that is upon him, with the solemn oath upon his soul, that he will preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution to the best of his ability, the President not only has a constitutional right, but it is his inexorable duty to suppress by sufficiently summary means, anything and everything, anywhere and everywhere, within the Union, which, directly or indirectly, adds strength to the rebellion. Tell me not that there is no rebellion in the loyal states. If any man in Pennsylvania or Massachusetts is guilty of any act which tends to aid the rebel arms, or to obstruct or impede the President in his work of crushing out the rebellion, that man is a part and parcel of the rebellion, as much so as is the soldier who carries a rebel musket in the field; and it is as clearly the President's duty to suppress him as it is to suppress those in arms.

But the courts in the loyal states are open, it is urged, and there-

fore, why not do all this through them? Because he cannot so surely do it thus. The Constitution is imperative that *he shall* suppress such men; and there is nothing in the Constitution that permits him to evade it by leaving it to the hands of another department of the government, which is independent of him. And, besides, the courts *cannot* do it efficiently. When the traitors of the loyal state of Maryland were concocting their grand scheme to hurl the organized power of that state against the government, probably not a man of them was known to be guilty of any act for which he could even have been arrested by civil process. And whatever their offences against the laws might have been, and whatever the fidelity of the courts in that jurisdiction, the process of civil law would have been far too slow to prevent the consummation of the gigantic treason which would have added another state to the rebellion. And yet these men were doing more to aid the rebel cause than ten thousand armed men in the field could do. Courts could not have suppressed that unholy work, but the summary imprisonment of those few men saved the state of Maryland to the Union cause. And so in most other cases of disloyal practices in the loyal states. Adroit traitors, in loyal communities, can render more aid to the rebellion, without rendering themselves liable to any civil law, than ten times their number in the rebel army. That aid is none the less valuable to the enemy, or less dangerous to the government, for not being violations of statute laws. Statute books, and courts, and juries, cannot save the republic. The rebellion is one indivisible whole, comprising all the rebels in the land, North and South; and the President is charged with the duty of suppressing *all of it*. And if *he* is to do it, he must do it by military power—he must do it *all* by military power, for he cannot control any other power.

Assuming, then, that the President has the constitutional right to use any *needful* means to suppress rebellion, and, to this end, to use the like means to suppress everything that aids it, it must be confessed, that here we stand at the threshold of despotism. Here is the boundary line of our constitutional government, with a not very distinct line of demarcation between it and despotic power. I think I have made it plain that *necessity* is the only line. The President may do, he *must* do, whatever is necessary to suppress the rebellion, and preserve the life of the governmeut. But who is the *judge* of the necessity of any particular act? If the President is the final judge, there is virtually no limitation to his power in the premises, and we

make him a despot. Uudoubtedly he must judge in the first instance —there is no alternative—just as a man whose life is assailed, must judge immediately what degree of force is necessary to repel the attack and protect his own life. But it stands the President in hand to judge wisely, just as it does the individual. The man who kills his assailant *unnecessarily*, will not be held guiltless by a court and jury, who are the final judges of the transaction. Exactly so with the President. His government is assailed, and its life imperilled by armed and unarmed traitors. The Constitution empowers him to do everything that is necessary to suppress these traitors, all of them, to the end that the life of the government may be saved—just as the law empowers an individual to do everything necessary to suppress an assassin to save his own life. But beyond this necessity, the President has not an iota of power more than any other man. While he may lawfully shoot down armed and resisting rebels, because they cannot be otherwise suppressed, to take the lives of unarmed rebels in the North, or of prisoners taken in arms, would be murder, because their further aid to the rebellion can be suppressed by imprisonment. To take their lives is, therefore, not necessary, and not constitutional. And while he may lawfully suppress disloyal practices in the North, by imprisoning their authors, because such is the mildest efficient means to that end, and therefore necessary to the suppression of the rebellion, the imprisonment of any other persons would be unconstitutional and false, and the President and every other person engaged in it would be personally liable in law for the same. Such is the constitutional theory upon which we are authorized to make war against rebellion.

The President and his subordinates are, therefore, under a delicate and terrible responsibility. While the Constitution requires him to do anything and everything necessary to suppress all men who, in any manner, or in any degree aid the rebellion, the courts will hold them accountable for any acts beyond this; and Congress cannot relieve them from this responsibility. To do so would be to authorize the violation of the Constitution, and it is scarcely necessary to say that such an act would be null and void. Inasmuch as the President has *constitutional* power to do all that is *necessary* to suppress rebellion, he needs no protection from Congress for the exercise of this power; and as there is no power anywhere in the government to go beyond this, I think it is self-evident that Congress cannot grant any power in the premises; and if it cannot do this, it cannot relieve the President or anybody else from the legal consequences of a usurpation.

Now, if I have succeeded in demonstrating that the Constitution empowers the President to imprison persons by military power, to suppress disloyal and dangerous practices, I think it clearly follows, as a concomitant to this power, that he may suspend the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus, because the writ of habeas corpus is inconsistent with that kind of imprisonment. For instance, in the case of those Maryland prisoners to whom I have alluded; they were arrested and imprisoned by military authority, under the clearest necessity to the public safety. Suppose they had been brought immediately before a judge on a writ of habeas corpus. The judge would have inquired simply into the legality of the imprisonment. If legal, they would have been remanded to prison; if not legal, they would have been discharged. The civil courts are, as I have said, independent of the President. They have no jurisdiction of military affairs, nothing to do with the President's work of suppressing rebellion. Their province is to administer the laws as they find them on the statute-books, and nothing else; so that with those men before Judge Taney, or any other judge, on a writ of habeas corpus, without any charge of crime regularly entered against them according to the civil code, they would necessarily have been discharged, to pursue their work of treason, and the President's power in the premises would have been nugatory. This independence of the judiciary, this antagonism, if you please, between the civil and the military authorities, is what creates the necessity for the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus at all. This is why the suspension was not entirely prohibited in the Constitution. Its sole object is to prevent the courts from paralyzing the military arm of the government in times of public danger. If the courts were bound to take cognizance of military necessities, and were competent to appreciate them, there would be no need of a constitutional power to suspend the writ of habeas corpus at all. If Judge Hall, at New Orleans, could have administered the law of military necessity, as General Jackson found it pressing upon him, the general would have had no occasion to suspend the writ of habeas corpus.

All this shows the suspension of the writ to be purely a military prerogative. It is constitutionally permitted, only as a military necessity—i. e., "in cases of rebellion or invasion, when the public safety may require it;" and none but the military authorities can know when the public safety does require it.

The constitutional provision that "the privilege of the writ of ha-

beas corpus shall not be suspended, unless when, in cases of rebellion or invasion, the public safety may require it," is not a *grant* of the power to *suspend* it, as superficial statesmen seem to suppose; but merely a *limitation* of the power, which it implies, is granted to somebody, in some other part of the Constitution. And the fact that this limitation is found in the article devoted chiefly to the legislative department, does not imply that the power is in Congress; for the *section* in which it stands contains limitations and prohibitions clearly applying to others as well as to Congress. The power in question grows out of the constitutional facts that this is a government; that it has a right to perpetuate itself, and that the power is a necessary incident to the unlimited power to suppress rebellion, which is committed to the hands of the President, as I have tried to elucidate.

It may be added, furthermore, in respect to this whole matter, that independently of the specific constitutional charge that is upon the President to suppress rebellion, as I have tried to set it forth, his constitutional appointment to be commander-in-chief of the army and navy, without prescribing the powers of that office, invests him with all the usual powers of a commander-in-chief, as recognized by the usages of civilized nations. By this criterion, he is the supreme ruler in all that appertains to the conduct of a war. His primary business is to subdue the enemy, and his discretion in the use of the means placed in his hands to that end, is limited only by the laws of nations, and the Constitution as hereinbefore set forth. His commands in this behalf, limited as aforesaid, are the law of the land for the time, and supercede whatever civil laws may be in conflict with them; for war—civil war especially—is an appeal *above* the civil laws, and not the execution of them. This being so, it needs no argument to prove that anything whatever, in any part of the country, that tends to impede the progress of the national army in suppressing this rebellion, by strengthening or encouraging the enemy, or otherwise, directly or indirectly, may be lawfully suppressed by military authority.

Now, a word as to the clamor about despotism, and the danger of the subversion of the Constitution and the people's liberties. War partakes very much of the character of despotism, the best way we can fix it; necessarily so, in the nature of things; recognized to be so by the laws of nations, and so accepted by our Constitution; so that it is no subversion of the Constitution for a war to be carried on

in the way that wars are always carried on, in the way that wars *must* be carried on, if they are wars at all; i. e., by power more or less despotic. And, with the constitutional limitations and responsibilities, as hereinbefore stated, I think there is not the slightest danger that these war powers will be permanently fixed in the ordinary administration of the government. They are in the President's hands for use upon disloyal persons, and nobody else; they exist during the war, and at no other time; and for the purpose of suppressing the rebellion, and for no other purpose. Can any man with professions of loyalty to his government on his lips, object to this? Any objections to it are objections to suppressing the rebellion at all.

Say ye that these are dangerous powers to concede to a President, with a million or so of soldiers at his back? No, the *use of these powers* can, in any event, be dangerous only to the rebellion and the rebels, for they reach not an inch beyond them. If, however, you will have it that our liberties are just now endangered in this behalf, the danger results not from the existence or the exercise of these powers to suppress the rebellion, but from the constitutional fact that the President has command of the army of the nation, and the possibility that he may *overreach* these powers, and *thus* rob us of our liberties. To a tyrant chieftain, however, with an invincible army to do his bidding, it matters not where you draw the line of his lawful powers. Draw it where you will, it will not retard his advance to the goal of his ambition. But, after all, if you must insist that our present proverbially honest and patriotic Chief Magistrate is bent on the subversion of the liberties of his country, we have a certain security in the army that he commands; an army not of mercenaries fighting for a master and for their bread, but an army made up of our own citizens, a part of the great constituency of the Republic, from every nook and corner of the land, our sons, our brothers, and our neighbors, representing the sovereignty of the nation in the field; fighting, not for Abraham Lincoln, or for any other man, fighting, not to destroy their own government and their own liberties, but fighting only to crush out this rebellion, for the Constitution and the Union, for their own liberties, as well as ours. In an army such as this we have all the safety that a rebellion, such as this, admits of.

In conclusion, therefore, the Constitution is sufficient for any emergency of national danger. It invests the government with ample power to preserve and perpetuate itself, without impairing the rights, or endangering the liberties of the people. Let all the people of the

loyal states sustain and defend it, in the only way in which it can possibly be sustained and defended in such a time as this; *i. e.*, by aiding and encouraging, sustaining and supporting, the lawful agents of the government, in striking down its confessed enemies. Then we shall have no arbitrary arrests in loyal states; then this rebellion will speedily totter to its fall; then this Union will be established as upon the rock of ages; then we may defy the machinations of all the despotic powers of the Old World to impede our progress, or to cripple our power; then our tree of liberty will take a deeper root, and send its branches upward and outward until they encircle the whole earth.

HYDE PARK, PA., *June*, 1863.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 33.

THE TWO WAYS OF TREASON;

OR,

THE OPEN TRAITOR OF THE SOUTH FACE TO FACE WITH HIS SKULKING ABETTOR AT THE NORTH.

By force of sheer reiteration, thousands of ignorant and thoughtless people at the North, as well as in Europe, have been persuaded into the belief that the Government of the United States, and the loyal people who sustain it, were in some way responsible for the war which now, for nearly three years, has devastated the country; or, at least, that they might at any time honorably end it, and restore peace and tranquillity if they chose.

Presuming upon their ability to bewilder and mislead the popular mind, the secret abettors of the rebellion, under the name of Peace Democrats, have undertaken to organize a political party upon these wholly unfounded assumptions, and so, by dividing the people of the North, give the most efficient aid and comfort to the slave barons, in their war to overthrow free institutions on this continent.

Said *Horatio Seymour*, at the Academy of Music, in the city of New York, on the 4th day of July, 1863: "WE stood before this community a few years ago, to warn them of the dangers of sectional strife. Again, at a later day, when the clouds of war overhung our country, WE implored those in authority to *compromise that difficulty*. You have the results of these unheeded warnings and unheeded prayers; *they* have stained our soil with blood; they have carried mourning into thousands of homes, and to-day they have brought our country to the very verge of destruction."

Said Mr. *Pugh*, in a speech to 50,000 voters, who nominated Horatio Seymour's friend Vallandigham, and resolved to elect him Governor of Ohio—as witness "*The Society for the Diffusion of Political Knowledge*"—"I know that slaves and suppliants pretending once to have been with us, give themselves the task of asserting that the South would not accept any *reasonable terms of compromise*. It is not a matter of opinion with me, for I was a member of Congress and familiar with the transactions of which I speak. Mr. LINCOLN and his supporters were entreated, earnestly entreated, as well as warned, NOT TO LAUNCH THIS COUNTRY INTO THE VORTEX OF CIVIL WAR; but they scorned entreaty and laughed at advice."

And President *Morse* of that same "*Society for the Diffusion of Political Knowledge*," under date of March 2d, 1863, said: "To the action of Mr. Field and his radical associates in the Peace Congress, can be traced the present awful condition of the country."

To all this and much more of the same tenor, daily poured forth from the Copperhead press, what says Mr. A. H. Stephens, the present Vice-President of the so-called Southern Confederacy, and without doubt the ablest thinker of all those engaged in the great treason?

In the Georgia State Convention, held in January, 1861, to determine the question of secession for that State, Mr. Stephens gave utterance to the following memorable words:

"This step (of secession) once taken, can never be recalled; and all the baleful and withering consequences that must follow, will rest on the convention for all coming time. When we and

our posterity shall see our lovely South desolated by the demon of war, WHICH THIS ACT OF YOURS WILL INEVITABLY INVITE AND CALL FORTH; when our green fields of waving harvest shall be trodden down by the murderous soldiery and fiery car of war sweeping over our land; our temples of justice laid in ashes; all the horrors and desolations of war upon us; WHO BUT THIS CONVENTION WILL BE HELD RESPONSIBLE FOR IT? and who but him who shall have given his vote for this unwise and ill-timed measure, as I honestly think and believe, SHALL BE HELD TO STRICT ACCOUNT FOR THIS SUICIDAL ACT BY THE PRESENT GENERATION, AND PROBABLY CURSED AND EXECRATED BY POSTERITY FOR ALL COMING TIME, for the wide and desolating ruin that will inevitably follow this act you now propose to perpetrate? Pause, I entreat you, and consider for a moment what reasons you can give that will even satisfy yourselves in calmer moments—what reasons you can give to your fellow-sufferers in the calamity that it will bring upon us. WHAT REASONS CAN YOU GIVE TO THE NATIONS OF THE EARTH TO JUSTIFY IT? They will be the calm and deliberate judges in the case; and what cause or one overt act can you name or point, on which to rest the plea of justification? WHAT RIGHT HAS THE NORTH ASSAILED? What interest of the South has been invaded? What justice has been denied? and what claim founded in justice and right has been withheld? Can either of you to-day name one governmental act of wrong, deliberately and purposely done by the government of Washington, of which the South has a right to complain? I challenge the answer. While, on the other hand, let me show the facts (and believe me, gentlemen, I am not here the advocate of the North; but I am here the friend, the firm friend and lover of the South and her institutions, and for this reason I speak thus plainly and faithfully for yours, mine, and every other man's interest, the words of truth and soberness), of which I wish you to judge, and I will only state facts which are clear and undeniable, and which now stand as records authentic in the history of our country. When we of the South demanded the slave trade, or the importation of Africans for the cultivation of our lands, did they not yield the right for twenty years? When we asked a three-fifths representation in Congress for our slaves, was it not granted? When we asked and demanded the return of any fugitive from justice, or the recovery of those persons owing labor or allegiance, was it not incorporated in the Constitution, and again ratified and strengthened by the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850? But do you reply that in many instances they have violated this compact, and have not been faithful to their engagements? As individual and local communities, they may have done so; but not by the sanction of government; for that has always been true to Southern interests. Again, gentlemen,

look at another fact, when we have asked that more territory should be added, that we might spread the institution of slavery, have they not yielded to our demands in giving us Louisiana, Florida and Texas, out of which four States have been carved, and ample territory for four more to be added in due time, if you, by this unwise and impolitic act, do not destroy this hope, and, perhaps, by it lose all, and have your last slave wrenched from you by stern military rule, as South America and Mexico were; or by the vindictive decree of a universal emancipation, which may reasonably be expected to follow. But, again, gentlemen, what have we to gain by this proposed change of our relation to the general government? We have always had the control of it, and can yet, if we remain in it and are as united as we have been. We have had a majority of the presidents chosen from the South; as well as the control and management of most of those chosen from the North. We have had sixty years of Southern presidents to their twenty-four, thus controlling the executive department. So of the judges of the Supreme Court, we have had eighteen from the South, and but eleven from the North; although nearly four-fifths of the judicial business has arisen in the Free States, yet a majority of the Court has always been from the South. This we have required, so as to guard against any interpretation of the Constitution unfavorable to us. In like manner we have been equally watchful to guard our interests in the legislative branch of government. In choosing the presiding presidents (*pro tem.*) of the Senate, we have had twenty-four to their eleven. Speakers of the house, we have had twenty-three, and they twelve. While the majority of the representatives, from their greater population, have always been from the North, yet we have so generally secured the Speaker, because he, to a greater extent, shapes and controls the legislation of the country. Nor have we had less control in every other department of the general government. Attorney-Generals we have had fourteen, while the North have had but five. Foreign ministers we have had eighty-six and they but fifty-four. While three-fourths of the business which demands diplomatic agents abroad, is clearly from the Free States, from their greater commercial interests, yet we have had the principal embassies, so as to secure the world markets for our cotton, tobacco, and sugar, on the best possible terms. We have had a vast majority of the higher offices of both army and navy, while a larger proportion of the soldiers and sailors were drawn from the North. Equally so of clerks, auditors, and comptrollers filling the executive department, the records show for the last fifty years that of three thousand thus employed, we have had more than two-thirds of the same, while we have btk one-third of the white population of the Republic. Again, loou

at another item, and one, be assured, in which we have a great and vital interest; it is that of revenue, or means of supporting government. From official documents we learn that a fraction over three-fourths of the revenue collected for the support of government has uniformly been raised from the North. Pause now while you can, gentlemen, and contemplate carefully and candidly these important items. Leaving out of view, for the present, the countless millions of dollars you must expend in a war with the North; with tens of thousands of your sons and brothers slain in battle, and offered up as sacrifices upon the altar of your ambition—and for what? we ask again. Is it for the overthrow of the American government, established by our common ancestry, cemented and built up by their sweat and blood, and founded on the broad principles of right, justice, and humanity? And, as such, I must declare here, as I have often done before, and which has been repeated by the greatest and wisest of statesmen and patriots in this and other lands, that it is the best and freest government—the most equal in its rights, the most just in its decisions, the most lenient in its measures, and the most aspiring in its principles to elevate the race of men, that the sun of heaven ever shone upon. Now, for you to attempt to overthrow such a government as this, under which we have lived for more than three-quarters of a century—in which we have gained our wealth, our standing as a nation, our domestic safety while the elements of peril are around us, with peace and tranquillity accompanied with unbounded prosperity and rights unassailed—is the height of *madness*, *folly*, and *wickedness*, to which I can neither lend my sanction nor my vote."

The war, then, according to the words of the frank and open traitor, was "inevitably called forth by the act of secession," and that they who perpetrated that act will be held responsible for it—"WILL BE HELD TO A STRICT ACCOUNT FOR THAT SUICIDAL ACT BY THE PRESENT GENERATION, AND PROBABLY CURSED AND EXECRATED BY POSTERITY FOR ALL COMING TIME."

The eminently sleek and specious Mr. Seymour, then, when he stood before "this community" on that 4th day of July, 1863, and declared "that it was the results of his unheeded warnings that had stained our soil with blood, and to-day had brought our country to the very verge of destruction," must have been either ignorant of the purport of the act to which Mr. Stephens refers, or, if he knew it, like a false and traitorous demagogue, he con-

cealed the truth from his audience, for the sinister purpose of arousing their prejudices and evil passions against the national government, in its struggle to preserve the national life.

At all events, as to the war, and who should be held accountable for it, the WORD of the open traitor stands point blank against that of the other.

It is true, that notwithstanding his clear sense of the enormous crime about to be committed, and of the terrible consequences which were sure to follow, Mr. Stephens had previously pledged himself to go with his state, and he went. He had said to the Legislature of Georgia, Nov. 14th, 1860, in urging them, in opposition to Toombs, Cobb and others, not to precipitate the state into secession by legislative action, but to call a convention of the people: "Should Georgia determine to go out of the Union, though my views might not agree with them, whatever the result may be, I shall bow to the will of the people. Their cause is my cause, their destiny my destiny." But at the same time and to that same Legislature he said: "I look upon this country, with our institutions, as the Eden of the world, the Paradise of the universe. It may be that out of it, we may become greater and more prosperous [that was the argument of Toombs and his coadjutors]; but I am candid and sincere in telling you that I fear, if we rashly and without sufficient cause, shall take that step [secession], that, instead of becoming greater or more peaceful, prosperous and happy—instead of becoming gods, we will become DEMONS."

It is something for a man, if his patriotism is not great enough to embrace his whole country, to love even his own state, and be willing to sacrifice himself to its judgments, however blind and erroneous. At least, it is in striking contrast with the sinister and skulking demagogues here at the North, who, for the paltry ends of personal advancement, in the name of democracy and peace, do not hesitate to put at risk the ruin of both country and state.

Certainly, if one were to judge from the recent public efforts of Mr. *Seymour* to sophisticate and pervert the popular judgment of the country, the slightest conception of the great cause of the war would never be reached; but on the contrary, the inevitable conclusion would be, that it arose here at the North,

in some atrocious attempt, not of the rebels, but of the National Government and of the Loyal People who sustain it, to overthrow the National Constitution, and subvert the personal rights and liberties of the citizen.

War has been well called "the scourge of God." To suppose he ever permits its use in his government of the world, except to purge some otherwise fatal human guilt, would be, not only to ignore all the lessons of history, but to derogate from the paternal character of God himself. And yet, if the chiefs of the Copperhead Coil are to be believed, our present war sprung out of the opinions of a class of men here at the North, who hold to the apparently innocent belief, that when you have discovered a poisonous weed growing in your garden, a good way to get rid of it is to pluck it up by the roots—to eradicate it—and thence their terrible name of RADICALS.

Not only is the war to be ascribed to the opinions of these radicals, but it is their opinions also which prevent the rebels from laying down their arms, "when," as was announced in that last Cooper Institute dribble, "*we* have put them in that frame of mind, that they will be content to remain under our government." To hold to the opinion that, so long as the cause of a thing exists, you never can be sure of the non-existence of the thing itself, however adroitly you may settle the terms of its cessation; to hold that so long as the living root of Slavery remains in the National soil, and men drink of its poisonous juices, they cannot do otherwise than become traitors, because in its own nature, Slavery is treason to the fundamental idea of our Free Institutions. This is the head and front of the Radicals' offence! Can there be any doubt in any Copperhead brain, as to the necessity of some great expiation for such a crime? Treason and rebellion count for mere piccadillos in the presence of such guilt!

It is true there is quite another view of the matter, but that arises within the lines of the open rebellion.

The rebel Brigadier-Gen. E. W. Gantt, of Arkansas, late a member of the Confederate Congress, has just issued an address to the people of that rebel State, in which he declares Slavery to be the cause of the war, and proceeds to set forth his way to

peace, which is by no means a Copperhead one, as follows:

"Its existence (slavery) had become incompatible with the existence of the Government. For, while it had stood as a wall, damming up the current and holding back the people and laborers of the North, it had, by thus precluding free intercourse between the sections, produced a marked change in their manners, customs and sentiments. And the two sections were growing more divergent every day. This wall or the Government, one must give way. The shock came which was to settle the question. I thought that the Government was divided, and negro Slavery established forever. *I erred. The Government was stronger than Slavery. Reunion is certain, but no more certain than the downfall of Slavery.* As I have said, the mission of the latter is accomplished. And, as his happiness must always be subordinated to that of the white man, he must, ere long, depart on the foot-prints of the red man, whose mission being accomplished, is fast fading from our midst.

"Let us, fellow-citizens, endeavor to be calm. Let us look these new ideas and our novel position squarely in the face. *We fought for negro Slavery. We lost. We may have to do without it.* The inconvenience will be great for a while—the loss heavy. This, however, is already well nigh accomplished. Yet behind this dark cloud is a silver lining—if not for us, at least for our children. In the place of these bondsmen will come an influx of people from all parts of the world, bringing with them their wealth, arts and improvements, and lending their talents and sinews to increase our aggregate wealth. Thrift and trade, and a common destiny, will bind us together.

"Let us live in hope, my grief-stricken brothers, that the day is not far distant when Arkansas will rise from the ashes of her desolation, to start on a path of higher destiny, than, with negro Slavery she ever could have reached; while the reunited Country, freed from this cankering sore, will be more vigorous and powerful, and more thrifty, opulent and happy, than though the scourge of war had never desolated her fields, or made sorrowful her hearthstones.

"The sooner we lay down our arms, and quit this hopeless struggle, the sooner our days of prosperity will return.

"I have witnessed the desolation of the Southern States from one end to the other. This hopeless struggle widens it. Each day makes new graves, new orphans, and new mourners! Each hour flings into this dreadful whirlpool more of wrecked hopes, broken fortunes, and anguished hearts. The rich have mostly fallen. The poor have drunk deep of the cup of sorrow, while surely, and not slowly, the tide of ruin, in its resistless surge,

sweeps toward the middle classes. A few more campaigns, and they will form a part of the general wreck. Each grave and each tear, each wasted fortune and broken heart, puts us that much further off from the object of the struggle, and that much further off from peace and happiness.

"Viewing it thus, the terrible question was presented to me as to whether I should continue my lot in an enterprise so fruitless and so full of woe, and help hold the masses of the people on to this terrible despotism of DAVIS, where only ruin awaits them; or whether I should be a quiet observer of it all, or, lastly, whether I should assist in saving the remnant of you from the wreck.

"I have chosen the latter."

But then there are still other views as to PEACE within the rebel lines.

To the insidious "implorings" of Horatio "to those in authority to COMPROMISE that difficulty," what answer comes from the open traitors at the rebel capital?

The Richmond *Enquirer* of the 16th ultimo, the acknowledged organ of the maddened rebel, contains the following manifesto on the subject of

"PEACE."

"Save on our own terms, we can accept no peace whatever, and must fight till doomsday, rather than yield an iota to them, and our terms are:

"Recognition by the enemy of the independence of the Confederate States.

"Withdrawal of the Yankee forces from every foot of Confederate ground, including Kentucky and Missouri.

"Withdrawal of the Yankee soldiers from Maryland, until that State shall decide, by a free vote, whether she shall remain in the old Union, or ask admission into the Confederacy.

"Consent on the part of the Federal Government, to give up to the Confederacy its proportion of the navy as it stood at the time of secession, or to pay for the same.

"Yielding up of all pretension, on the part of the Federal Government, to that portion of the old Territories which lies west of the Confederate States.

"An equitable settlement on the basis of our absolute independence and equal rights of all accounts of the public debt and public lands, and the advantages accruing from foreign treaties.

"These provisions, we apprehend, comprise the minimum of what we must require before we lay down our arms. That is to say, the North must yield all,—we nothing. The whole pretention of that country to prevent, by force, the separation of the States must be abandoned, which will be equivalent to an avowal that our enemies were wrong from the first; and, of course, as they waged a causeless and wicked war upon us, they ought, in strict justice, to be required, according to usage in such cases, to reimburse to us the whole of our expenses and losses in the course of that war. Whether this last proviso is to be insisted upon or not, certain we are that we cannot have any peace at all, until we shall be in a position, not only to demand an exact, but also to enforce and collect treasure for our own reimbursement out of the wealthy cities in the enemy's country. In other words, unless we can destroy or scatter their armies, and break up their Government, we can have no peace; and if we can do that, then we ought not only to extort from them our own full terms and ample acknowledgment of their wrong, but also a handsome indemnity for the trouble and expense caused to us by their crime.

"Now, we are not yet in position to dictate those terms to our enemies, with ROSENCRANS' army still in the heart of our country, and MEADE still on Virginia soil, but though it is too soon to propose such conditions to them, yet it is important that we should keep them plainly before our own eyes as the only admissible basis of any conceivable peace. This well fixed in the Confederate mind, there will be no more fearful looking for news from Europe, as if that blessed peace were to come to us over the sea, and not to be conquered on our own ground. There will be no more gaping for hints of recognition and filling of the belly with the east wind; no more distraction or diversion from the single momentous business of bracing up every nerve and sinew of the country for battle.

"It is especially now, at the moment when great and perhaps decisive battles are impending at two or three points, that we think it most essential to insist upon the grand and entire magnificence of the stake and cause.

"Once more we say it is all or nothing. This Confederacy or the Yankee nation, one or other, goes down, down to perdition. That is to say, one or the other must forfeit its national existence and lie at the mercy of its mortal enemy.

"We all know by this time the fate in store for us if we succumb. The other party has no smaller stake.

"As surely as we completely ruin their armies—and without that is no peace nor truce at all—so surely shall we make them pay our war debt, though we wring it out of their hearts. And

they know it well, and, therefore, they cannot make peace except through their utter exhaustion and absolute inability to strike another blow.

"The stake they have to forfeit, then, if they lose this dreadful game, is as vital as ours. So is the stake to be won if they win anything. It is no less than the entire possession of our whole country, with us in it, and everything that is ours, from Ohio to the Rio Grande, to have and to hold, to them and their heirs forever.

But, on the other hand, what we mean to win is utter separation from them for all time. We do not want to govern their country, but after levying upon it what seemeth good to us by way of indemnity, we leave it to commence its political life again from the beginning, hoping that the lesson may have made them sadder and wiser Yankees.

"We shut them out forever, with all their unclean and scoundrelly ways, intending to lead our lives here in our own Confederate way, within our own well-guarded bounds, and without, as St. John says, are dogs.

"And let no Confederate feeble knees and tremulous backbone say to us, this complete triumph is impossible; say that we must be content with some kind of compromise, and give and take; on the contrary, we must gain all or lose all, and that the Confederates will indeed win the giant game, we take to be as certain as any future event in this uncertain world.

"MEADE'S army and ROSENCRANS' once scattered, LINCOLN can get no more armies. The draft turns out manifestly fruitless. Both the German and Irish element are now for peace. The Yankees have to bear the brunt of the war themselves, but in the meantime their inevitable bankruptcy is advancing like an armed man. Hungry ruin has them in the wind. It cannot be long before the Cabinet of Washington will have, indeed, to consider seriously proposals for peace, under auspices and circumstances very different from the present. For the present the war rolls and thunders on, and may God defend the right."

And yet, after all this, with that same bland and benignant countenance, with even more than the ordinary sheen of the copper in it, Horatio again stands before "this community," at the Cooper Institute, Oct. 31st, 1863, and says: "There is no fair-minded man who will stand up and say that it is as easy to subjugate the South as it is to conciliate the South;" and then imploringly asks: "Why is it that this war is so strangely prolonged? Why is it that, in detriment and injury to the rights of the people, it still rolls on?"

If it were in the nature of demagogues to be ashamed, under the fierce glare of this last outburst of rebel lunacy and rage, one might suppose that the memory of that Academy of Music performance, with its after-piece of "my friends" at the City Hall Park, and their interlude of conflagration and murder, all to stop the draft and secure the constitutional rights of "our Southern brethren," would redden even Horatio's brow. But it seems not; the last Cooper Institute exhibition having even more of the coppery creature's natural sinuosities in it than any of its predecessors.

From of old there have been two ways of attacking one's friend or country in calamity. The one is by an open blow, like Peter's denial, with an oath, in the porch of the High Priest's Palace—the other with an "all hail, my master," and the blandest kind of kisses, to betray into the hands of the enemy. To Peter, God granted the grace of repentance: that is not impossible to A. H. Stephens. With the general approval of all mankind, Horatio! Peter's contemporary went and hanged himself.

☞ *Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No.* 863 *Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.*

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY.

863 BROADWAY.

No. 34.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

PAPER BY EDWARD EVERETT.

Reprinted, by permission, from the New York Ledger.

In an elaborate article in the *London Quarterly Review* for January, 1862,* among the facts adduced to prove that the United States had pursued for fifty years an offensive course toward Great Britain, showing herself "not a loyal friend, but a grasping and bullying enemy," it was mentioned that President Pierce, on occasion of the negotiation between the two countries, relative to Central America, had "avowed his adherence to what is called the Monroe doctrine." At the close

* NOTE.—In this article on the *Trent* affair, it was maintained, that the capture of Messrs. Mason and Slidell was but one of a series of studied insults offered by the United States to Great Britain during the last fifty years, and these alleged insults were briefly enumerated and commented upon by the reviewer. In a series of articles in the *New York Ledger*, commenced in 1862 and continued during the preset year, these so-called insults have been carefully examined by Mr. Edward Everett. We understand that his articles will be published in a collective form. In the meantime, we have obtained permission to reprint the last of them, which is on "The Monroe Doctrine," as one of the tracts of the "Loyal Publication Society of New York." It appeared originally in the *Ledger* for the 3d October last.

of the article I observed, that, as far as the so-called Monroe doctrine "bore upon the affairs of Spanish America, it had the concurrence and warm approval of the British Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. George Canning."

It was hardly to be expected that, so soon after Mr. Canning's time, the Monroe doctrine should so far have lost favor in England, that it should be characterized by a leading journalist as a national insult, and the act of a grasping and bullying enemy, for an American President to adhere to it. Even if the English government had wholly changed its own views on this subject (of which I have seen no proof), it was surely no matter of offense that an American President adhered to a declaration of one of his predecessors, made not merely with the approval of the British Minister for Foreign Affairs, but, as I shall presently show, at his earnest and persevering solicitation.

But though the British government, as far as I am aware, has given no intimation that it has changed its views on this subject (unless such an intimation is found in the lately repeated remark of Lord Palmerston, that perfect harmony exists between France and England as to the foreign policy of the two powers), it is confidently stated that the merchants of London "are well pleased with the course pursued by Louis Napoleon in Mexico." The following statement is found in the *City Article* of a recent number of the *London Times:* "It would be vain to deny that the feeling of the merchants of London is that, on the whole, so far as the affair has proceeded, the Emperor Napoleon has done a great service, both political and commercial, to the world—political, in confirming the previous action of Spain in extinguishing the Monroe doctrine; and commercial, in restoring the intercourse of nations with a territory which, from its geographical position and mineral wealth, can claim a general and almost exceptional importance."

It is very likely that individual "merchants of London,"

concerned in running the blockade, or in speculating in the Confederate loan, may be pleased with any event which may make difficulty between France and the United States, but I greatly doubt that the "merchants of London," as a body, are delighted to have either the commerce or politics of Mexico controlled from the Tuileries. As for the statement just quoted, it contains a grave error of fact. Spain has never, that I am aware of, attempted "to extinguish the Monroe doctrine." On the contrary, from the moment she recognized the independence of her revolted colonies, she acquiesced in that doctrine, which, as far as concerned those colonies, was, that the United States would not be indifferent to any attempt of France and the Holy Alliance to aid Spain in subjugating them.

Not only has Spain made no attempt to "extinguish" the Monroe doctrine, but, conjointly with England, she withdrew from the expedition lately undertaken in concert by the three powers, as soon as she found that France intended to conquer and occupy the country. It remains to be seen how far Spain, a proud and sensitive power of the Latin stock, will rejoice at having her ancient colonial kingdom of New Spain turned into an empire, for the benefit of a German prince, by the *fiat* of the sovereign of France, and with remainder to any other candidate to be named by him, if the Archduke Maximilian should decline.

The point, however, which I propose at present to illustrate is, that the doctrine, whose extinguishment is now considered by "the London merchants" so great a political and commercial benefit, was announced by President Monroe, not merely with the approval of the British Minister of Foreign Affairs, *but at his earnest and often repeated solicitations.*

In December, 1822, the dominion of Spain over her former colonies on the continent of America being manifestly at an end, England determined so far to recognize them as to send consuls

to some of the principal ports. In March following (1823), Mr. Canning, at that time Minister of Foreign Affairs, addressed a despatch to the British Minister at Madrid, in which, while he disclaimed, on the part of Great Britain, all intention of appropriating to herself the smallest portion of the late Spain colonies, he intimated at the same time, his conviction, that "no attempt would be made by France to bring under her dominion any of those possessions, either by conquest or cession from Spain." France, it will be remembered, was at this time invading Spain for the purpose of putting down the constitutional government and restoring Ferdinand Seventh to absolute power. As the invasion drew near to a successful issue, symptoms began to appear of a design on the part of the French government, to reimburse themselves for the expenses of the expedition out of the American colonies, and in order to paralyze the expected opposition of England, to call a congress of the continental powers forming the "Holy Alliance." They were depended upon to sustain France in this movement, because the Spanish colonies were regarded by the members of the Holy Alliance as rebellious subjects, setting at defiance the authority of their legitimate sovereign.

The great object which the British government now proposed to itself, under the auspices of Mr. Canning, was to baffle these designs of France and the Holy Alliance on the Spanish colonies, and for this there were three motives: 1. To avenge the affront offered to Great Britain by the invasion of her ally, Spain; 2. To "redress the balance of power disturbed in the East by calling into existence a new world in the West;" 3. To procure for England the benefit of an unrestricted commerce with the American colonies. Fearing, however, that a formal recognition of the independence of those colonies would involve England in a war with the continental powers, Mr. Canning determined to try the efficacy of an "open, straighforward

declaration of his future intentions." His first step, in order to give added weight to such a declaration, was to solicit the co-operation of the American government. Accordingly, on the 16th of August, 1823, in an interview with Mr. Rush, he inquired whether the United States would not join Great Britain in such a declaration, adding that if France entertained designs on Mexico, he (Mr. Canning) "was satisfied that the knowledge that the United States would be opposed to it as well as England, could not fail to have its decisive influence in checking it." Mr. Rush, being without instructions, could make no reply to this overture, except that he would communicate it to his government.

On the 22d of the month, being about to leave town, Mr. Canning addressed an unofficial and confidential note to Mr. Rush, renewing the overture for a joint declaration to be made by the United States and Great Britain, to the effect that, while they aimed at the possession of no portion of the Spanish colonies for themselves, and would not obstruct any amicable negotiations which Spain, as the mother country, might attempt with them, "they could not see the transfer of any portion of them to any other power with indifference."

Four days later, being then at Liverpool, Mr. Canning wrote a second letter to Mr. Rush, urging the joint declaration, on the ground that information had reached him that, as soon as France had effected her military objects in Spain, a proposal would be made for a European congress to settle the affairs of Spanish America.

Five days later (31st August) Mr. Canning addressed a third letter to Mr. Rush from the country, intimating that events might make it necessary for him to act without waiting for the co-operation of the United States. On his return to town on the 18th of September, he had another conference with Mr. Rush on the same subject, in the course of which he pressed

upon the American Minister, *to the point of importunity*, the expediency of the proposed declaration. In case a congress of the European powers should be called to dispose of the affairs of Spanish America, he stated that he should insist on the United States being represented. Mr. Rush yielded so far to Mr. Canning's urgent solicitations as to promise at length, if Great Britain would at once recognize the Spanish colonies, that he would take the responsibility, even without instructions, of joining in the declaration.

Eight days after this interview, another conference took place between Mr. Rush and Mr. Canning, at the request of the latter, still earnestly soliciting the co-operation of the United States. Mr. Rush having made the recognition of the Spanish colonies by England a condition precedent, Mr. Canning now asked if he would not join in the declaration, provided England would promise to recognize the colonies *hereafter*. The subject was discussed at two other interviews between Mr. Canning and Mr. Rush, in the course of the autumn, and the reader will perhaps be pleased to see a specimen of the arguments by which the former urged the adoption by the United States, in conjunction with England, of the Monroe doctrine. Mr. Rush having stated that it had been the traditionary rule of the government of the United States not to interfere with European politics, Mr. Canning replied:

"However just such a policy might have been formerly, or "might continue to be as a general policy, he apprehended that "powerful and controlling circumstances made it inapplicable "upon the present occasion. The question was a new and com- "plicated one in modern affairs. It was also full as much Ameri- "can as European, *to say no more*. It concerned the United States "under aspects and interests as immediate and commanding, as it "did or could any of the states of Europe. They were the first "power established on that continent, and confessedly the leading "power. They were connected with Spanish America by their po-

"sition, as with Europe by their relations; and they also stood con-
"nected with these new states by political relations. *Was it pos-*
"*sible that they could see with indifference their fate decided upon*
"*by Europe?* Could Europe expect this indifference? Had not
"a new epoch arrived in the relative position of the United States
"toward Europe which Europe must acknowledge? *Were the*
"*great potitical and commercial interests, which hung upon the*
"*destinies of the new Continent, to be canvassed and adjusted in*
"*this hemisphere, without the co-operation, or even knowledge of*
"*the United States?* Were they to be canvassed and adjusted,
"he would even add, without some proper understanding be-
"tween the United States and Great Britain, as the two chief
"commercial and maritime states of both worlds? He hoped
"not, he would wish to persuade himself not."

Such was the vehemence with which Mr. Canning urged the United States to assume the ground of the Monroe doctrine. Mr. Rush, of course, communicated these overtures from time to time to his government. His first despatches on the subject were received in Washington by the end of August, 1823. The subject immediately engaged the attention of Mr. Monroe and his cabinet. In addition to the counsel of his official advisers, the President sought that of Mr. Jefferson, to whom he sent copies of Mr. Rush's letters. Mr. Jefferson warmly recommended the step proposed by Mr. Canning, and encouraged Mr. Monroe to make the desired declaration. His cabinet concurred in the advice, and accordingly, in his message at the opening of the next session of Congress, the President, after alluding to the radical difference of the political systems of Europe and America, expressed himself as follows:

"We owe it therefore to candor and to the amicable relations
"existing between the United States and those powers to de-
"clare, that we should consider any attempt on their part to
"extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dan-
"gerous to our peace and safety. With the existing colonies or
"dependencies of any European power we have not interfered

" and shall not interfere. But with the governments who have " declared their independence and maintained it, and whose in- " dependence we have on great consideration and on just prin- " ciples acknowledged, we could not view any interposition for " the purpose of oppressing them or controlling in any other " manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other " light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition to- " ward the United States."

Such, as far as Spanish America is concerned, was this celebrated declaration to which Mr. Canning had so importunely urged the United States. In another part of the same message, and in reference to the negotiation with Russia, relative to the boundaries of the two powers on the north-western coast of the continent, President Monroe observed that,

" In the discussion to which this interest has given rise, the " occasion has been judged proper for asserting, as a principle, " in which the rights and interests of the United States are in- " volved, that the American Continents, by the free and indepen- " dent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are " henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future coloni- " zation by any European power."

These two statements of principle, in parts of Mr. Monroe's message, remote from each other and relating to totally different subjects, from what is usually called the Monroe doctrine. Much confusion of ideas has existed with reference to its purport and intended application, which I shall not attempt on this occasion to explain. I will only observe that it has never, in any acceptation, received a legislative confirmation; that it rests upon its original basis, as an executive declaration, wise and seasonable at the time it was made, creditable to the administration from which it proceeded, and beneficial to the country and the cause of free government throughout the world.

The message containing these declarations of President Monroe reached England, while the correspondence between Mr. Canning and the Prince de Polignac, the French Ambassador at London, was in progress. "Fortunately," says Mr. Stapleton, the private secretary and biographer of Mr. Canning, "just at the moment when these discussions were being carried on, the message of the President of the United States to their Congress arrived in Europe, in which document it was stated 'that any interference on the part of the great powers of Europe for the purpose of oppressing or controlling the destinies of the Spanish American states which had declared their independence, would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States, and would be considered as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards them.'" Mr. Stapleton then claims that the correspondence of Mr. Canning with Mr. Rush, "mainly encouraged, if it did not originate to the government of the United States the idea of taking so firm and decisive a tone," and adds that, "when coupled with the refusal of Great Britain to take part in a congress, it effectu, ally put an end to the project of assembling one similar to those which had met at Vienna, Aix-la-Chapelle, Laybach and Verona."

The reception of the presidential declaration by the English public in general and in parliament might be called enthusiastic. Mr. (now Lord) Brougham said "the question with regard to South America now was, he believed, disposed of or nearly so; for an event had recently happened, *than which no event had ever dispersed greater joy, exultation, and gratitude over all the freemen of Europe;* that event which was decisive on the subject, was the language held with respect to Spanish America, in the speech or message of the President of the United States to the Congress."

Mr. Stapleton, in quoting this remark of Lord Brougham, asks, "but was not that language which, in Mr. Brougham's

opinion, was decisive on the subject, in a very great degree, if not wholly, the result of Mr. Canning's overture to Mr. Rush?"

Sir James Mackintosh, alluding to the message, said:

"That wise government, in grave but determined language, "and with that reasonable but deliberate tone that becomes true "courage, proclaims the principles of her policy and makes "known the cases in which the care of her own safety will com- "pel her to take her up arms for the defence of other states. "I have already observed its coincidence with the declarations "of England, which, indeed, is perfect, if allowance be made "for the deeper, or at least more immediate interest in "the independence of South America, which near neighbor- "hood gives to the United States. This coincidence of the two "great English commonwealths (for so I delight to call them, "and I heartiiy pray that they may be forever united in the "cause of justice and liberty), cannot be contemplated without "the utmost pleasure by every enlightened citizen of the earth."

Would that words like these were oftener heard in the British parliament!

There was one point only in this part of the President's message to which Mr. Canning excepted. He understood it to deny not only the right of other foreign powers to interfere for the recovery of the Spanish American Colonies, but the right of the mother country to continue her efforts for that purpose. He thought it necessary to declare that he did not assent to that principle, and it is quite doubtful whether Mr. Monroe, though he used the phrase "*any* European power," meant to interfere between Spain and her former colonies. Lord John Russell, however, urged that if, after the invasion of Spain by France, a Spanish army were sent by Ferdinand to re-subjugate the colonies, inasmuch as such Spanish army would have been set at liberty by the French occupation, the expedition should be regarded as virtually French, and as such resisted by England.

Such, as far as Mexico is concerned, is the Monroe doctrine; such its origin, such its significance, such its history; urged, all but forced on the United States by the importunity of England hailed with rapture in her parliament on its announcement, claimed on behalf of Mr. Canning as the work of his hands, admitted to have been decisive of the leading measure of his administration, now quoted among the studied insults which the United States have for fifty years been offering to Great Britain; another proof that instead of being a loyal friend to that country, she has shown herself to be a "grasping and a bullying enemy;" and the "merchants of London" are rejoiced that a French invasion, the precise movement which Mr. Canning in 1823 urged the United States to join him in forbidding, has succeeded in trampling in the dust the policy which England then had so much at heart, and to which it is as much her interest now as ever to adhere!

Boston, 2d September, 1863.

LETTER OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS,

ON THE MONROE DOCTRINE.

Reprinted from the Providence Journal.

QUINCY, August 11, 1837.

Rev. Wm. E. Channing, D. D., Newport, R. I.:

MY DEAR SIR: * * * I rejoice to learn that you have it in contemplation to give the public your ideas on the appearance in the political world of the new republic of Texas.

Mr. Tuckerman wrote to me as you had requested, and I answered his letter, but he had mistaken the time when the transactions to which you desired reference to be had, occurred, and supposed they had happened during the administration of my father. My answer, therefore, must have been unsatisfac- to the object of your inquiries.

It was in September, 1822, that the events, to which I alluded in my speech in the House of Representatives of the 25th of May, 1836, took place. It was the time when the Spanish government of the Cortes was overthrown by the French invasion under the Duke d'Angouleme. Great Britain became alarmed lest, under the shelter of that revolution, the Island of Cuba should pass into the possession of France. The French government fabricated or was imposed upon by a report that the British cabinet had determined to send a squadron and take possession of the island. The people of Havana, divided into parties between the Cortes and the King, were terrified by

premonitory symptoms of negro insurrection, and looking round for a protector. There was a party for resorting to Great Britain, a party for adhering to Spain, and a party for seeking admission to the North American Union—the last of which was the strongest. A proposition was then made by a secret agent from them to Mr. Monroe, to this effect—that they, by a popular movement, of the success of which they had no doubt, would declare the island independent of Spain, if the government of the United States would promise them protection and admit them into their Union under a state constitution, on the model of those of our Southern states, and with the understanding that as the population of the island should increase, they should be at liberty to divide themselves into two states, and have that proportion of representation in the Congress of the United States. As the inducement to the American government to pledge their protection, they were assured that the alternative would probably be the prevalence of the party in the island for the colonial connection with Great Britian, and a resort to her for protection. While this proposition was under consideration of Mr. Monroe and his cabinet, the French Minister at Washington, by a verbal, irresponsible communication, not to the Secretary of State, the only medium of *official* intercourse between foreign ministers and the government of the United States, but to Mr. Crawford, the Secretary of the Treasury, asseverated that the French government had secret but positive information that the British government had deliberately determined to take possession of Cuba.

The answer of Mr. Monroe to the proposition from the Havana was, that the friendly relations existing between the people of the United States and Spain did not permit them to promise countenance or protection to any insurrectional movement against her authority. Their advice to the people of Cuba was to adhere as long as possible to their allegiance to Spain—that an

attempt of either Great Britain or France to occupy the island would present the proposal from the Havana under a different point of view, concerning which the President was not authorized to pledge prospectively the action of the United States, but that the people of the Havana might be assured of the deep interest, which, under all the circumstances which might occur, the American Government would take in their welfare and their wishes.

It was the opinion of at least one member of Mr. Monroe's administration that the occupation of the Island of Cuba by Great Britain should be resisted, even at the cost of a war. Their unanimous opinion was, that a very explicit though confidential communication should be made to Mr. Canning, that the United States *could not see with indifference* the occupation of Cuba by any European Power other than Spain—and that *rumors* had reached the American government that such an intention was entertained by the British cabinet, which made it necessary to ask an explanation of their views.

Mr. Rush was instructed accordingly. Mr. Canning disavowed emphatically all intention on the part of Great Britain to take possession of the island; but avowed her determination *not to see with indifference* its occupation either by France or the United States, and he told Mr. Rush of the squadron dispatched by Louis XVIII. to the West Indies, without notifying *him* of expedition, and of the schooling he had ordered the British Ambassador at Paris to give the French cabinet for that sin of omission. Mr. Canning then proposed that, by a mutual understanding between the British, French and American Governments, without any formal treaty or convention, Cuba should be left in the quiet possession of Spain, without interference in the government of the island. This was precisely the policy which Mr. Monroe believed to be bset adapted to the interests and the duties of the United States, and he cheerfully assented to it.

There was no further communication between him and the French government on the subject. So far as France was concerned, the arrangement was left to be concerted between her and Great Britain. The people of the Island of Cuba submitted to the government of Ferdinand, restored by the Duke d'Angouleme, and received a viceroy and captain-general in the person of Gen. Vives, who had been minister from Spain to the United States—one of the most upright and honorable men with whom it has ever been my fortune to hold political relations. He was precisely the man to tranquilize and conciliate the submission of the people of the island to their old government, and he so effectually accomplished that purpose that the government of the United States heard nothing further of intended insurrection in Cuba, during the remainder of Mr. Monroe's administration and the whole of mine.

All these transactions were at the time profoundly secret. The first public allusion to them ever made was by me, in the speech of the 25th of May, 1836, to the House of Representatives. The circumstances of the times no longer required absolute secrecy. France, Spain and Britain had all undergone political revolutions, and the abolition of slavery in the British colonies of this hemisphere had added tenfold terrors to *her* occupation of Cuba, for the meditation of our Southern statesmen. I partly raised the veil, therefore, from the negotiations of 1822, to stay the frantic hand of the Southern slaveholder, rushing from the terror of an avenging conscience into the arms of sympathizing Slavery in Texas.

* * * * * * *

I am, of course, your unalterable friend,

J. Q. Adams.

THE BALANCE OF POWER IN EUROPE.

Extract from a Speech of the Right Hon. George Canning on the Relations of Portugal, in the House of Commons, December 12th, 1826.

"Again, sir, is the Spain of the present day, the Spain of which the statesmen of the times of William and Anne were so much afraid? Is it indeed the nation whose puissance was expected to shake England from her sphere? No, sir; it was quite another Spain. It was the Spain within the limits of whose empire the sun never set—it was Spain 'with the Indies,' that had excited the jealousies and alarmed the imaginations of our ancestors.

"But then, sir, the balance of power! The entry of the French army into Spain, disturbed that balance, and we ought to have gone to war to restore it! I have already said, that when the French army entered Spain, we might, if we chose, have resisted or resented that measure by war. But were there no other means than war for restoring the balance of power? Is the balance of power a fixed and unalterable standard? Or is it a standard perpetually varying as civilization advances, and as new nations spring up and take their place among established political communities? The balance of power, a century and a half ago, was to be adjusted between France and Spain, the Netherlands, Austria and England. Some years afterwards, Russia assumed her high station in European politics. Some

years after that again, Prussia became, not only a substantive, but a preponderating monarchy. Thus, while the balance of power continued in principle the same, the means of adjusting it became more varied and enlarged. They became enlarged in proportion to the increased number of considerable states—in proportion, I may say, to the number of weights which might be shifted into one or the other scale. To look to the policy of Europe, in the times of William and Anne, for the purpose of regulating the balance of power in Europe at the present day, is to disregard the progress of events, and to confuse dates and facts, which throw a reciprocal light upon each other.

"It would be disengenuous, indeed, not to admit that the entry of the French army into Spain was, in a certain sense, a disparagement—an affront to the pride—a blow to the feelings of England. And it can hardly be supposed, that the government did not sympathize, on that occasion, with the feelings of the people.

"But I deny that, questionable or censurable as the act may be, it was one that necessarily called for our direct and hostile opposition. Was nothing, then, to be done? Was there no other mode of resistance, than by a direct attack upon France, or by a war, to be undertaken on the soil of Spain? What if the possession of Spain might be rendered harmless in rival hands—harmless as regards us, and valueless to the possessors? Might not compensation for disparagement be obtained, and the policy of our ancestors vindicated by means better adapted to the present time? If France occupied Spain, was it necessary, in order to avoid the consequences of that occupation, that we should blockade Cadiz? No. I looked another way. I sought materials for compensation in another hemisphere.

"*Contemplating Spain, such as our ancestors had known her, I resolved that, if France had Spain, it should not be Spain 'with the Indies.' I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old.*"

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
863 BROADWAY, NEW YORK

No. 35.

THE

ARGUMENTS OF SECESSIONISTS.

A

LETTER TO THE UNION MEETING,

Held in New York, September 30, 1863.

BY FRANCIS LIEBER.



New York:
HOLMAN, BOOK AND JOB PRINTER, COR. OF CENTRE AND WHITE STS.
1863.

LETTER

TO THE

UNION MEETING.

GENTLEMEN,—I regret that your invitation to address the citizens who will assemble to-morrow evening for the purpose of ratifying the nominations for our approaching State elections, came to hand so late that previous engagements make it impossible for me to accept it. I should otherwise have felt great pleasure in contributing my humble share to the important meeting.

The State elections which will soon take place in Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and other portions of our imperiled country, are of the last importance with reference to the issue of our great war, to the character of our foreign relations—now of a magnitude to which they have never before attained—and to the serious condition of affairs within the different Northern States.

The arguments urged against us in our present struggle, manifold as they are, may be reduced to the following main points:

Secession, it has been urged, *is* revolution; it is a struggle for independence; and what right have you, whose entire government and national existence are founded on the idea that there exists such a thing as a right of revolution, according to which a new government may be established—what right have you to resist the South if its people choose to establish a separate polity? All my friends who return from Europe tell me that this is the ever-repeated argument dinned in the ears of Northerners traveling in that portion of the globe. This argument sounds, indeed, as if separation, without any reference to the reasons or objects,

were justifiable, simply because it *is* separation, as though disintegration of itself were a valuable thing. The lopping off a branch from a noble tree might as well be recommended, because it is lopping off. Is ruthless destruction more commendable than organic cohesion? The South do not fight for independence, as the British statesman pronounced it at the earliest stage of our civil war, for the very simple reason that the South never was dependent; on the contrary, it has always predominated. There is not a single point of resemblance between our Revolution and the rebellion of the South. Take our Declaration of Independence, go through the reasons given there for our separation from Great Britain, one by one, and it will be found that not a solitary one is claimed or could be claimed by the South against us. We formed distant colonies, and all large transmarine colonies are destined, in the course of history, to form, at some period or other, independent empires. Who doubts it of New South Wales? The South formed no distant dependency of ours; no sea separates it from us; but, on the contrary, it forms part and parcel of one great continuous country, marked as one by the dignified geography of our land and the many uniting rivers, as well as by the history of the people, and of their better institutions. Our fathers separated from England, after long hesitation, on the solemnly-avowed ground of liberty. They considered themselves oppressed; they believed all men entitled to certain rights. The South separates on the avowed ground of Slavery. That word, idolized by them, and turned away from with bitter aversion by all other men, is inscribed on their banner. There you read in red letters, Slavery, our Corner-Stone.

Mr. Chevallier, in his last pamphlet, states, among many other absurdities, that the North has no *ideas*, but the South gallantly fights for *ideas*. If we are void of ideas, what then induced the many hundred thousand of our brethren and sons to march, battalion after battalion, to confront the enemy? But even if we were very paupers in ideas, would an empty head not be better than a brain that has but one idea, and that one idea *Slavery?* I make free to say to our Gallican censor, and Imperial Senator, that ideas have no value of themselves. Every thing depends upon whether the ideas are pure or vicious, wise or foolish, great or little. A burglar has also his very distinct idea, for which he

works sedulously, ingeniously, and sometimes heroically; but somehow or other, we do not like his idea, and try to stop it, and to substitute for it another idea, such as Sing Sing, or Auburn.

Yet, even were it otherwise, is it then wholly forgotten that a revolution implies two parties, who must fight it out; and we, the one of the interested parties, must be acknowledged to have the right of saying No? If it were not so, there would be no revolution. We fight in this, our trying struggle, emphatically for our own. We fight for the integrity of our country, of which Louisiana or Georgia belongs to me, as citizen of the United States, quite as much as to any Georgian or Louisiana man; and I have a right as well as the duty to fight for it as much so as a Frenchman would have to fight for his France should Languedoc declare itself independent on some unlucky day.

But say others, and it is sad to observe there are many Northerners of great notoriety among them, we have no right to fight the South, inasmuch as they, being sovereign States, had a sovereign right to secede. We deny it. We maintain that the word sovereignty applied to our States has merely slipped into our political language—merely slipped in, and much mischief has it done. The Constitution does not contain the word once from beginning to end. Let us, however, for argument's sake accept this position. Either the South had a perfect right to secede, or it had no such right. If the latter, we are of course right in fighting for our Government, for Law, and Country; and if the South had a right to secede, why then they constitute a sovereign nation, and we, being a sovereign nation too, have, according to all law of nations, the right of conquering another sovereign nation.

Again, it is said that in fighting against the South we fight against the first of all American principles, namely, that which ascribes the foundation and essence of all true and good government to the consent of the governed. Mr. O'Sullivan, a New Yorker, I am grieved to say, calls this principle "Americanism," in a pamphlet, of which a large number has been sent from England to the United States, to convert those who stubbornly *resist* the South. It is a very sad production, yet not without its humor. Thus Mr. O'Sullivan urges upon every patriot in the North the duty of repudiating our own debt, and of assuming the debts of the South. But to leave the jocose part of the pamphlet, the pam-

phleteer declares that every Northern Democrat is in duty bound to acknowledge the right of the South to establish a government on the consent of the governed. "Americanism" is not exclusively American. The Netherlanders pronounced it long ago, and we ask has this principle reference to the foundation of a government and the permanent enacting of laws, or to each case in which government acts? Far the greater portion of all business which a government has to perform, consists in making certain people do what they do not consent to. If a policeman collars a pick-pocket, must he let off the offender in all cases in which the criminal does not consent to be collared, which I suppose would form the majority of cases?

Lastly, I would mention the argument of sentimentality. The Southerners are our brethren, we are told—let us not imbrue our hands in the blood of our brethren, even if they are erring ones. A cut-throat is our brother, too, before the Most High, who alone can distinguish which of us is essentially the greatest sinner, weighing education, temptation, and want; but this does not prevent a Judge from sentencing him if duly convicted. Blood is a sad thing, but it can not always be prevented, nor is it the worst thing. The sentimentality argument seems so futile that it would not have been referred to, were it not very frequently used by our peace men, who in truth ought to call themselves *piece* men, for what they drive at, or what the adoption of their measures would surely lead to, is the hewing and hacking of our country to pieces.

Let us put our utmost zeal to our coming election, so that, among other things, the draft be carried out fairly, fully, and honestly. It is necessary, and becomes the more urgently so, the nearer we draw to the end; for we must fill up our regiments gallantly thinning before the enemy, and we shall stand in need of a large army for the period when the country shall pass from the state of tumultuous rebellion to returning and supported peace and order.

The flattering violence with which I have occasionally been assailed, might induce some people to believe that my authority must be of some weight. I am far from claiming it, but I ask, nevertheless, permission to state, in conclusion, that in my deliberate opinion the draft is constitutional, legal, and necessary; that England has never given up the right of drafting, and ab-

stains from making use of it only for foreign wars—not, however, upon any constitutional grounds ; that every great people must resort to drafting in large and prolonged wars, unless the Prussian system be adopted, according to which every man, without exception, is obliged to serve, and does serve, even in times of peace, for a limited period ; that no nation is worthy of the name that can not stand a draft in times of emergency ; nor can it maintain its position among the great and leading nations of the earth if it can not, on occasion, furnish its government with an army proportionate to its own greatness ; and that, lastly, a foreigner by birth, who comes to this country to enjoy its material advantages and the freedom she bountifully grants to all, natives or adopted, makes an inadequate return for these benefits when, in times of need, he disclaims the duty of fighting for these benefits, and throws away the right and privilege to fight for her.

With my best wishes for the success of your meeting.

Your very obedient,

FRANCIS LIEBER.

New York, Sept. 29, 1863.

Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals, may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No. 863 Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,
863 BROADWAY.

No. 36.

PROPHECY AND FULFILLMENT.

SPEECH OF A. H. STEPHENS, OF GEORGIA,

(Vice-President of so-called Confederate States)

IN OPPOSITION TO SECESSION.

DELIVERED NOVEMBER 14, 1860.

Fellow-Citizens :—I appear before you to-night, at the request of members of the Legislature and others, to speak of matters of the deepest interest that can possibly concern us all of an earthly character. There is nothing—no question or subject connected with this life—that concerns a free people so intimately as that of the Government under which they live. We are now, indeed, surrounded by evils. Never, since I entered upon the public stage, has the country been so environed with difficulties and dangers that threatened the public peace and the very existence of society as now. I do not now appear before you at my own instance. It is not to gratify desire of my own that I am here. Had I consulted my own ease and pleasure I should not be before you ; but, believing that it is the duty of every good citizen to give his counsels and views whenever the country is in danger, as to the best policy to be pursued, I am here. For these reasons, and these only, do I bespeak a calm, patient, and attentive hearing.

My object is not to stir up strife, but to allay it; not to appeal to your passions, but to your reason. Good governments can never be built up or sustained by the impulse of passion. I wish to address myself to your good sense, to your good judgment, and if, after hearing, you disagree, let us agree to disagree, and part as we met, friends. We all have the same object, the same interest. That people should disagree in republican governments, upon questions of public policy, is natural. That men should disagree upon all matters connected with human investigation, whether relating to science or human conduct, is natural. Hence, in free governments, parties will arise. But a free people should express their different opinions with liberality and charity, with no acrimony toward those of their fellows, when honestly and sincerely given. These are my feelings to-night.

Let us, therefore, reason together. It is not my purpose to say aught to wound the feelings of any individual who may be present; and if, in the ardency with which I shall express my opinions, I shall say any thing which may be deemed too strong, let it be set down to the zeal with which I advocate my own convictions. There is with me no intention to irritate or offend.

The first question that presents itself is, shall the people of the South secede from the Union in consequence of the election of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidency of the United States? My countrymen, *I tell you frankly, candidly, and earnestly, that I do not think that they ought.* In my judgment, the election of no man, constitutionally chosen to that high office, is sufficient cause for any State to separate from the Union. It ought to stand by and aid still in maintaining the Constitution of the country. To make a point of resistance to the Government, to withdraw from it because a man has been constitutionally elected, puts us in the wrong. We are pledged to maintain the Constitution. Many of us have sworn to support it. Can we, therefore, for the mere election of a man to the Presidency, and that too in accordance with the prescribed forms of the Constitution, make a point of resistance to the Government without becoming the breakers of that sacred instrument ourselves—withdraw ourselves from it? Would we not be in the wrong? Whatever fate is to befall this country, let it never be laid to the charge of the people of the South, and especially to the people of Georgia, that we were untrue to our national engage-

ments. Let the fault and the wrong rest upon others. If all our hopes are to be blasted, if the Republic is to go down, let us be found to the last moment standing on the deck, with the Constitution of the United States waving over our heads. Let the fanatics of the North break the Constitution, if such is their fell purpose. Let the responsibility be upon them. I shall speak presently more of their acts; but let not the South—let us not be the ones to commit the aggression. We went into the election with this people. The result was different from what we wished; but the election has been constitutionally held. Were we to make a point of resistance to the Government and go out of the Union on that account, the record would be made up hereafter against us.

But it is said Mr. Lincoln's policy and principles are against the Constitution, and that if he carries them out it will be destructive of our rights. Let us not anticipate a threatened evil. If he violates the Constitution, then will come our time to act. Do not let us break it because, forsooth, he may. If he does, that is the time for us to strike. I think it would be injudicious and unwise to do this sooner. I do not anticipate that Mr. Lincoln will do any thing to jeopard our safety or security, whatever may be his spirit to do it; for he is bound by the constitutional checks which are thrown around him, which at this time render him powerless to do any great mischief. This shows the wisdom of our system. The President of the United States is no emperor, no dictator—he is clothed with no absolute power. He can do nothing unless he is backed by power in Congress. The House of Representatives is largely in the majority against him.

In the Senate he will also be powerless. There will be a majority of four against him. This, after the loss of Bigler, Fitch, and others, by the unfortunate dissensions of the National Democratic party in their States. Mr. Lincoln can not appoint an officer without the consent of the Senate—he can not form a cabinet without the same consent. He will be in the condition of George III. (the embodiment of Toryism), who had to ask the Whigs to appoint his ministers, and was compelled to receive a cabinet utterly opposed to his views; and so Mr. Lincoln will be compelled to ask of the Senate to choose for him a cabinet, if the Democracy of that body choose to put him on such terms. He will be com-

pelled to do this or let the Government stop, if the National Democratic men—for that is their name at the North—the conservative men in the Senate, should so determine. Then how can Mr. Lincoln obtain a cabinet which would aid him, or allow him to violate the Constitution?

Why, then, I say, should we disrupt the ties of this Union when his hands are tied, when he can do nothing against us? I have heard it mooted that no man in the State of Georgia, who is true to her interests, could hold office under Mr. Lincoln. But, I ask, who appoints to office? Not the President alone; the Senate has to concur. No man can be appointed without the consent of the Senate. Should any man then refuse to hold office that was given to him by a Democratic Senate? [Mr. Toombs interrupted and said if the Senate was Democratic it was for Mr. Breckinridge.] Well, then, continued Mr. S., I apprehend no man could be justly considered untrue to to the interests of Georgia, or incur any disgrace, if the interests of Georgia required it, to hold an office which a Breckinridge Senate had given him, even though Mr. Lincoln should be President.

I trust, my countrymen, you will be still and silent. I am addressing your good sense. I am giving you my views in a calm and dispassionate manner, and if any of you differ with me, you can, on any other occasion, give your views as I am doing now, and let reason and true patriotism decide between us. In my judgment, I say, under such circumstances, there would be no possible disgrace for a Southern man to hold office. No man will be suffered to be appointed, I have no doubt, who is not true to the Constitution, if Southern Senators are true to their trusts, as I can not permit myself to doubt that they will be.

My honorable friend who addressed you last night (Mr Toombs), and to whom I listened with the profoundest attention, asks if we would submit to Black Republican rule? I say to you and to him, as a Georgian, I never would submit to any Black Republican *aggression* upon our constitutional rights. I will never consent myself, as much as I admire this Union for the glories of the past, or the blessings of the present—as much as it has done for the people of all these States—as much as it has done for civilization—as much as the hopes of the world hang upon it, I would never submit to aggression upon my rights to maintain it longer; and

if they cannot be maintained in the Union, standing on the Georgia platform, where I have stood from the time of its adoption, I would be in favor of disrupting every tie which binds the States together.

I will have equality for Georgia and for the citizens of Georgia in this Union, or I will look for new safeguards elsewhere. This is my position. The only question now is, can they be secured in the Union? That is what I am counseling with you to-night about. Can it be secured? In my judgment it may be, but it may not be; but let us do all we can, so that in the future, if the worst come, it may never be said we were negligent in doing our duty to the last.

My countrymen, I am not of those who believe this Union has been a curse up to this time. True men, men of integrity, entertain different views from me on this subject. I do not question their right to do so: I would not impugn their motives in so doing. Nor will I undertake to say that this Government of our fathers is perfect. There is nothing perfect in this world of a human origin. Nothing connected with human nature, from man himself to any of his works. You may select the wisest and best men for your judges, and yet how many defects are there in the administration of justice? You may select the wisest and best men for your legislators, and yet how many defects are apparent in your laws? And it is so in our Government.

But that this Government of our fathers, with all its defects, comes nearer the objects of all good governments than any other on the face of the earth is my settled conviction. Contrast it now with any on the face of the earth. [England, said Mr. Toombs.] —England, my friend says. Well, that is the next best, I grant; but I think we have improved upon England. Statesmen tried their apprentice hand on the Government of England, and then ours was made. Ours sprung from that, avoiding many of its defects, taking most of the good and leaving out many of its errors, and from the whole constructing and building up this model Republic—the best which the history of the world gives any account of.

Compare, my friends, this Government with that of Spain, Mexico, the South American Republics, Germany, Ireland—are there any sons of that down-trodden nation here to night?—Prussia, or,

if you travel further east, to Turkey or China. Where will you go, following the sun in its circuit round our globe, to find a government that better protects the liberties of its people, and secures to them the blessings we enjoy? I think that one of the evils that beset us is a surfeit of liberty, an exuberance of the priceless blessings for which we are ungrateful. We listened to my honorable friend who addressed you last night (Mr. Toombs), as he recounted the evils of this Government.

The first was the fishing bounties, paid mostly to the sailors of New England. Our friend stated that forty-eight years of our Government was under the administration of Southern Presidents. Well, these fishing bounties began under the rule of a southern President, I believe. No one of them during the whole forty-eight years ever set his Administration against the principle or policy of them. It is not for me to say whether it was a wise policy in the beginning; it probably was not, and I have nothing to say in its defense. But the reason given for it was to encourage our young men to go to sea and learn to manage ships. We had at the time but a small navy. It was thought best to encourage a class of our people to become acquainted with seafaring life, to become sailors—to man our naval ships. It requires practice to walk the deck of a ship, to pull the ropes, to furl the sails, to go aloft, to climb the mast; and it was thought, by offering this bounty, a nursery might be formed in which young men would become perfected in these arts, and it applied to one section of the country as well as to any other.

The result of this was that in the war of 1812 our sailors, many of whom came from this nursery, were equal to any that England brought against us. At any rate, no small part of the glories of that war were gained by the veteran tars of America, and the object of these bounties was to foster that branch of the national defense. My opinion is, that whatever may have been the reason at first, this bounty ought to be discontinued—the reason for it, at first, no longer exists. A bill for this object did pass the Senate the last Congress I was in, to which my honorable friend contributed greatly, but it was not reached in the House of Representatives. I trust that he will yet see that he may with honor continue his connection with the Government, and that his eloquence, unrivaled in the Senate, may hereafter, as heretofore, be displayed

in having this bounty, so obnoxious to him, repealed and wiped off from the statute-book.

The next evil which my friend complained of was the Tariff. Well, let us look at that for a moment. About the time I commenced noticing public matters, this question was agitating the country almost as fearfully as the slave question now is. In 1832, when I was in college, South Carolina was ready to nullify or secede from the Union on this account. And what have we seen? The Tariff no longer distracts the public counsels. Reason has triumphed! The present Tariff was voted for by Massachusetts and South Carolina. The lion and the lamb lay down together —every man in the Senate and House from Massachusetts and South Carolina, I think, voted for it, as did my honorable friend himself. And if it be true, to use the figure of speech of my honorable friend, that every man in the North that works in iron and brass and wood has his muscle strengthened by the protection of the Government, that stimulant was given by his vote, and I believe every other Southern man. So we ought not to complain of that.

Mr. Toombs—The Tariff assessed the duties.

Mr. Stephens—Yes, and Massachusetts with unanimity voted with the South to lessen them, and they were made just as low as Southern men asked them to be, and that is the rate they are now at. If reason and argument, with experience, produced such changes in the sentiments of Massachusetts from 1832 to 1857, on the subject of the Tariff, may not like changes be effected there by the same means—reason and argument, and appeals to patriotism on the present vexed question? And who can say that by 1875 or 1890 Massachusetts may not vote with South Carolina and Georgia upon all those questions that now distract the country, and threaten its peace and existence. I believe in the power and efficiency of truth, in the omnipotence of truth, and its ultimate triumph when properly wielded.

Another matter of grievance alluded to by my honorable friend was the Navigation Laws. This policy was also commenced under the Administration of one of these Southern Presidents who ruled so well, and has been continued through all of them since. The gentleman's views of the policy of these laws and my own do not disagree. We occupied the same ground in relation to them in

Congress. It is not my purpose to defend them now. But it is proper to state some matters connected with their origin.

One of the objects was to build up a commercial American marine by giving American bottoms the exclusive carrying trade between our own ports. This is a great arm of national power. This object was accomplished We have now an amount of shipping, not only coastwise, but to foreign countries, which puts us in the front rank of the nations of the world. England can no longer be styled the Mistress of the Seas. What American is not proud of the result? Whether those laws should be continued is another question. But one thing is certain: no President, Northern or Southern, has ever yet recommended their repeal. And my friend's efforts to get them repealed were met with but little favor, North or South.

These, then, were the true main grievances or grounds of complaint against the general system of our Government and its workings—I mean the administration of the Federal Government. As to the acts of the Federal States I shall speak presently; but these three were the main ones used against the common head. Now, suppose it be admitted that all of these are evils in the system; do they overbalance and outweigh the advantages and great good which this same government affords in a thousand innumerable ways that can not be estimated? Have we not at the South, as well as the North, grown great, prosperous, and happy under its operations? Has any part of the world ever shown such rapid progress in the development of wealth, and all the material resources of national power and greatness, as the Southern States have under the General Government, notwithstanding all its defects?

Mr. Toombs—In spite of it.

Mr. Stephens—My honorable friend says we have, in spite of the General Government; that without it, I suppose he thinks, we might have done as well, or perhaps better, than we have done this in spite of it. That may be and it may not be; but the great fact that we have grown great and powerful under the Government as it exists—there is no conjecture or speculation about that; it stands out bold, high, and prominent, like your Stone Mountain, to which the gentleman alluded in illustrating home facts in his record—this great fact of our unrivaled prosperity in the Union

as it is admitted; whether all this is in spite of the Government —whether we of the South would have been better off without the Government—is, to say the least, problematical. On the one side we can only put the fact against speculation and conjecture on the other. But even as a question of speculation I differ with my distinguished friend.

What we would have lost in border wars without the Union, or what we have gained simply by the peace it has secured, no estimate can be made of. Our foreign trade, which is the foundation of all our prosperity, has the protection of the navy, which drove the pirates from the waters near our coast, where they had been buccaneering for centuries before, and might have been still had it not been for the American Navy under the command of such spirits as Commodore Porter. Now that the coast is clear, that our commerce flows freely outwardly, we can not well estimate how it would have been under other circumstances. The influence of the Government on us is like that of the atmosphere around us. Its benefits are so silent and unseen that they are seldom thought of or appreciated.

We seldom think of the single element of oxygen in the air we breathe, and yet let this simple, unseen, and unfelt agent be withdrawn, this life-giving element be taken away from this all-pervading fluid around us, and what instant and appalling changes would take place in all organic creation.

It may be that we are all that we are in "spite of the General Government," but it may be that without it we should have been far different from what we are now. It is true there is no equal part of the earth with natural resources superior perhaps to ours. That portion of this country known as the Southern States, stretching from the Chesapeake to the Rio Grande, is fully equal to the picture drawn by the honorable and eloquent Senator last night, in all natural capacities. But how many ages and centuries passed before these capacities were developed to reach this advanced age of civilization? There these same hills, rich in ore, same rivers, same valleys and plains, are as they have been since they came from the hand of the Creator; uneducated and uncivilized man roamed over them for how long no history informs us.

It was only under our institutions that they could be developed.

Their development is the result of the enterprise of our people under operations of the Government and institutions under which we have lived. Even our people, without these, never would have done it. The organization of society has much to do with the development of the natural resources of any country or any land. The institutions of a people, political and moral, are the matrix in which the germ of their organic structure quickens into life—takes root and develops in form, nature, and character. Our institutions constitute the basis, the matrix, from which spring all our characteristics of development and greatness. Look at Greece. There is the same fertile soil, the same blue sky, the same inlets and harbors, the same Ægean, the same Olympus; there is the same land where Homer sung, where Pericles spoke; it is in nature the same old Greece—but it is living Greece no more.

Descendants of the same people inhabit the country; yet what is the reason of this mighty difference? In the midst of present degradation we see the glorious fragments of ancient works of art—temples with ornaments and inscriptions that excite wonder and admiration—the remains of a once high order of civilization which have outlived the language they spoke—upon them all Ichabod is written—their glory has departed. Why is this so? I answer, their institutions have been destroyed. These were but the fruits of their forms of government, the matrix from which their grand development sprung, and when once the institutions of a people have been destroyed, there is no earthly power that can bring back the Promethean spark to kindle them here again, any more than in that ancient land of eloquence, poetry, and song.

The same may be said of Italy. Where is Rome, once the mistress of the world? There are the same seven hills now, the same soil, the same natural resources; nature is the same, but what a ruin of human greatness meets the eye of the traveler throughout the length and breadth of that most down-trodden land! Why have not the people of that Heaven-favored clime the spirit that animated their fathers? Why this sad difference?

It is the destruction of her institutions that has caused it; and, my countrymen, if we shall in an evil hour rashly pull down and destroy those institutions which the patriotic band of our fathers

labored so long and so hard to build up, and which have done so much for us and the world, who can venture the prediction that similar results will not ensue? Let us avoid it if we can. I trust the spirit is among us that will enable us to do it. Let us not rashly try the experiment, for, if it fails, as it did in Greece and Italy, and in the South American Republics, and in every other place wherever liberty is once destroyed, it may never be restored to us again.

There are defects in our government, errors in administration, and shortcomings of many kinds; but in spite of these defects and errors, Georgia has grown to be a great State. Let us pause here a moment. In 1850 there was a great crisis, but not so fearful as this; for, of all I have ever passed through, this is the most perilous, and requires to be met with the greatest calmness and deliberation.

There were many among us in 1850 zealous to go at once out of the Union, to disrupt every tie that binds us together. Now, do you believe, had that policy been carried out at that time, we would have been the same great people that we are to-day? It may be that we would, but have you any assurance of that fact? Would you have made the same advancement, improvement, and progress in all that constitutes material wealth and prosperity that we have.

I notice, in the Comptroller-General's report, that the taxable property of Georgia is $670,000,000 and upward, an amount not far from double what it was in 1850. I think I may venture to say that for the last ten years the material wealth of the people of Georgia has been nearly if not quite doubled. The same may be said of our advance in education, and every thing that marks our civilization. Have we any assurance that, had we regarded the earnest but misguided patriotic advice, as I think, of some of that day, and disrupted the ties which bind us to the Union, we would have advanced as we have? I think not. Well, then, let us be careful now before we attempt any rash experiment of this sort. I know that there are friends—whose patriotism I do not intend to question—who think this Union a curse, and that we would be better off without it. I do not so think. If we can bring about a correction of those evils which threaten—and I am not without hope that this may yet be done—this appeal to go out,

with all tne provisions for good that accompany it, I look upon it as a great and I fear a fatal temptation.

When I look around and see our prosperity in every thing, agriculture, commerce, art, science, and every department of education, physical and mental, as well as moral advancement, and our colleges, I think, in the face of such an exhibition, if we can, without the loss of power, or any essential right or interest, remain in the Union, it is our duty to ourselves and to posterity to—let us not too readily yield to this temptation—do so. Our first parents, the great progenitors of the human race, were not without a like temptation when in the garden of Eden. They were led to believe that their condition would be bettered—that their eyes would be opened—and that they would become as gods. They in an evil hour yielded—instead of becoming gods, they only saw their own nakedness.

I look upon this country with our institutions as the Eden of the world, the paradise of the universe. It may be that out of it we may become greater and more prosperous, but I am candid and sincere in telling you that I fear if we rashly evince passion, and without sufficient cause shall take that step, that instead of becoming greater or more peaceful, prosperous, and happy—instead of becoming gods, we will become demons, and at no distant day commence cutting one another's throats. This is my apprehension. Let us, therefore, whatever we do, meet these difficulties, great as they are, like wise and sensible men, and consider them in the light of all the consequences which may attend our action. Let us see first clearly where the path of duty leads, and then we may not fear to tread therein.

I come now to the main question put to me, and on which my counsel has been asked. That is, what the present Legislature should do in view of the dangers that threaten us, and the wrongs that have been done us by several of our Confederate States in the Union, by the acts of their legislatures nullifying the fugitive slave law, and in direct disregard of their constitutional obligations. What I shall say will not be in the spirit of dictation; it will be simply my own judgment for what it is worth. It proceeds from a strong conviction that according to it our rights, interests, and honor—our present safety and future security can be maintained without yet looking to the last resort, the "*ultima ra-*

tio regum." That should not be looked to until all else fails. That may come. On this point I am hopeful, but not sanguine. But let us use every patriotic effort to prevent it while there is ground for hope.

If any view that I may present, in your judgment, be inconsistent with the best interests of Georgia, I ask you, as patriots, not to regard it. After hearing me and others whom you have advised with, act in the premises according to your own conviction of duty as patriots. I speak now particularly to the members of the legislature present. There are, as I have said, great dangers ahead. Great dangers may come from the election I have spoken of. If the policy of Mr. Lincoln and his Republican associates shall be carried out, or attempted to be carried out, no man in Georgia will be more willing or ready than myself to defend our rights, interest, and honor at every hazard and to the last extremity.

What is this policy? It is, in the first place, to exclude us, by an act of Congress, from the Territories with our slave property. He is for using the power of the General Government against the extension of our institutions. Our position on this point is and ought to be, at all hazards, for perfect equality between all the States, and the citizens of all the States, in the Territories, under the Constitution of the United States. If Congress should exercise its power against this, then I am for standing where Georgia planted herself in 1850. These were plain propositions which were then laid down in her celebrated platform as sufficient for the disruption of the Union if the occasion should ever come; on these Georgia has declared that she will go out of the Union; and for these she would be justified by the nations of the earth in so doing.

I say the same; I said it then; I say it now, if Mr. Lincoln's policy should be carried out. I have told you that I do not think his bare election sufficient cause: but if his policy should be carried out in violation of any of the principles set forth in the Georgia platform, that would be such an act of aggression which ought to be met as therein provided for. If his policy shall be carried out in repealing or modifying the Fugitive Slave law so as to weaken its efficacy, Georgia has declared that she will, in the last resort, disrupt the ties of the Union, and I say so too. I

stand upon the Georgia platform, and upon every plank, and say, if these aggressions therein provided for take place—I say to you and to the people of Georgia, keep your powder dry, and let your assailants then have lead, if need be. I would wait for an act of aggression. This is my position.

Now upon another point, and that the most difficult and deserving your most serious consideration, I will speak. That is the course which this State should pursue toward these Northern States, which by their legislative acts have attempted to nullify the Fugitive Slave law. I know that in some of these States their acts pretend to be based upon the principles set forth in the case of PRIGG against Pennsylvania; that decision did proclaim the doctrine that the State officers are not bound to carry out the provisions of a law of Congress—that the Federal Government can not impose duties upon State officials—that they must execute their own laws by their own officers. And this may be true. But still it is the duty of the States to deliver fugitive slaves, as well as the duty of the General Government to see that it is done.

Northern States, on entering into the Federal compact, pledged themselves to surrender such fugitives; and it is in disregard of their obligations that they had passed laws which even tend to hinder or obstruct the fulfillment of that obligation. They have violated their plighted faith; what ought we to do in view of this? That is the question. What is to be done? By the law of nations you would have a right to demand the carrying out of this article of agreement, and I do not see that it should be otherwise with respect to the States of this Union; and, in case it be not done, we would, by these principles, have the right to commit acts of reprisal on these faithless governments, and seize upon their property, or that of their citizens, wherever found. The States of this Union stand upon the same footing with foreign nations in this respect. But, by the law of nations, we are equally bound, before proceeding to violent measures, to set forth our grievances before the offending Government, to give them an opportunity to redress the wrong. Has our State yet done this? I think not.

Suppose it was Great Britain that had violated some compact of agreement with the General Government, what would be first done? In that case our Minister would be directed, in the first

instance, to bring the matter to the attention of that Government, or a Commissioner be sent to that country to open negotiations with her, ask for redress, and it would only be when argument and reason had been exhausted, that we should take the last resort of nations. That would be the course toward a foreign government, and toward a member of this Confederacy I would recommend the same course.

Let us, therefore, not act hastily in this matter. Let your Committee on the State of the Republic make out a bill of grievances; let it be sent by the Governor to those faithless States, and if reason and argument shall be tried in vain—all shall fail to induce them to return to their constitutional obligations—I would be for retaliatory measures, such as the Governor has suggested to you. This mode of resistance in the Union is in our power. It might be effectual, and, if in the last resort, we would be justified in the eyes of nations, not only in separating from them, but by using force.

[Some one said the argument was already exhausted.]

Mr. Stephens continued—Some friend says that the argument is already exhausted. No, my friend, it is not. You have never called the attention of the Legislatures of those States to this subject, that I am aware of. Nothing has ever been done before this year. The attention of our own people has been called to this subject lately.

Now, then, my recommendation to you would be this: In view of all these questions of difficulty, let a convention of the people of Georgia be called, to which they may be all referred. Let the sovereignty of the people speak. Some think that the election of Mr. Lincoln is cause sufficient to dissolve the Union. Some think those other grievances are sufficient to dissolve the same, and that the Legislature has the power thus to act, and ought thus to act. I have no hesitancy in saying that the Legislature is not the proper body to sever our Federal relations, if that necessity should arise. An honorable and distinguished gentleman, the other night (Mr. T. R. R. Cobb), advised you to take this course—not to wait to hear from from the cross-roads and groceries. I say to you, you have no power so to act. You must refer this question to the people, and you must wait to hear from the men at the cross-roads and even the groceries; for the people in this country, whether at

the cross-roads or the groceries, whether in cottages or palaces, are all equal, and they are the sovereigns in this country. Sovereignty is not in the Legislature. We, the people, are the sovereigns. I am one of them and have a right to be heard, and so has any other citizen of the State. You, legislators—I speak it respectfully—are but our servants. You are the servants of the people, and not their masters. Power resides with the people in this country.

The great difference between our country and all others, such as France and England and Ireland, is, that here there is popular sovereignty, while there sovereignty is exercised by kings and favored classes. This principle of popular sovereignty, however much derided lately, is the foundation of our institutions. Constitutions are but the channels through which the popular will may be expressed. Our Constitution came from the people. They made it, and they alone can rightfully unmake it.

Mr. Toombs—I am afraid of conventions.

Mr. Stephens—I am not afraid of any convention legally chosen by the people. I know no way to decide great questions affecting fundamental laws except by representatives of the people. The Constitution of the United States was made by the representatives of the people. The Constitution of the State of Georgia was made by representatives of the people chosen at the ballot-box. But do not let the question which comes before the people be put to them in the language of my honorable friend who addressed you last night. Will you submit to abolition rule or resist?

Mr. Toombs—I do not wish the people to be cheated.

Mr. Stephens—Now, my friends, how are we going to cheat the people by calling on them to elect delegates to a convention to decide all these questions without any dictation or direction? Who proposes to cheat the people by letting them speak their own untrammeled views in the choice of their ablest and best men, to determine upon all these matters involving their peace.

I think the proposition of my honorable friend had a considerable smack of unfairness, not to say cheat. He wished to have no convention, but for the Legislature to submit their vote to the people—submission to abolition rule or resistance? Now who, in Georgia, would vote "submission to abolition rule"?

Is putting such a question to the people to vote on a fair way of getting an expression of the popular will on all these questions? I think not. Now, who in Georgia is going to submit to abolition rule?

Mr. Toombs—The convention will.

Mr. Stephens—No, my friend, Georgia will never do it. The convention will never secede from the Georgia Platform. Under that there can be no abolition rule in the General Government. I am not afraid to trust the people in convention upon this and all questions. Besides, the Legislature were not elected for such a purpose. They came here to do their duty as legislators. They have sworn to support the Constitution of the United States. They did not come here to disrupt this Government. I am therefore for submitting all these questions to a convention of the people. Submit the question to the people, whether they would submit to an abolition rule or resist, and then let the Legislature act upon that vote? Such a course would be an insult to the people. They would have to eat their platform, ignore their past history, blot out their records, and take steps backward, if they should do this. I have never eaten my record or words, and never will.

But how will it be under this arrangement if they should vote to resist, and the Legislature should reassemble with this vote as their instruction? Can any man tell what sort of resistance will be meant? One man would say secede; another pass retaliatory measures; these are measures of resistance against wrong—legitimate and right—and there would be as many different ideas as there are members on this floor. Resistance don't mean secession—that, in no proper sense of the term, is resistance. Believing that the times require action, I am for presenting the question fairly to the people, for calling together an untrammeled convention, and presenting all the questions to them whether they will go out of the Union, or what course of resistance in the Union they may think best, and then let the Legislature act, when the people in their majesty are heard; and I tell you now, whatever that convention does, I hope and trust our people will abide by. I advise the calling of a convention with the earnest desire to preserve the peace and harmony of the State. I should dislike, above all things, to see violent measures adopted, or a disposition to

take the sword in hand, by individuals, without the authority of law.

My honorable friend said last night, "I ask you to give me the sword, for if you do not give it to me, as God lives, I will take it myself."

Mr. Toombs—I will.

Mr. Stephens—I have no doubt that my honorable friend feels as he says. It is only his excessive ardor that makes him use such an expression; but this will pass off with the excitement of the hour. When the people in their majesty shall speak, I have no doubt that he will bow to their will, whatever it may be upon the "sober second thought."

Should Georgia determine to go out of the Union—I speak for one, though my views might not agree with them—whatever the result may be, I shall bow to the will of her people. Their cause is my cause, and their destiny is my destiny; and I trust this will be the ultimate course of all. The greatest curse that can befall a free people is civil war.

But, as I said, let us call a convention of the people; let all these matters be submitted to it, and when the will of a majority of the people has thus been expressed, the whole State will present one unanimous voice in favor of whatever may be demanded; for I believe in the power of the people to govern themselves, when wisdom prevails and passion is silent.

Look at what has already been done by them for their advancement in all that ennobles man. There is nothing like it in the history of the world. Look abroad from one extent of the country to the other—contemplate our greatness. We are now among the first nations of the earth. Shall it be said, then, that our institutions, founded upon principles of self-government, are a failure?

Thus far it is a noble example, worthy of imitation. The gentleman, Mr. Cobb, the other night said it had proven a failure. A failure in what? In growth? Look at our expanse in national power. Look at our population and increase in all that makes a people great. A failure? Why, we are the admiration of the civilized world, and present the brightest hopes of mankind.

Some of our public men have failed in their aspirations; that is true, and from that comes a great part of our troubles.

No, there is no failure of this Government yet. We have made great advancement under the Constitution, and I can not but hope that we shall advance higher still. Let us be true to our cause.

Now, when this convention assembles, if it shall be called, as I hope it may, I would say in my judgment, without dictation, for I am conferring with you freely and frankly, and it is thus that I give my views, I should take into consideration all those questions which distract the public mind; should view all the grounds of secession so far as the election of Mr. Lincoln is concerned, and I have no doubt they would say that the constitutional election of no man is a sufficient cause to break up the Union, but that the State should wait until he at least does some unconstitutional act.

Mr. Toombs—Commit some overt act.

Mr. Stephens—No, I did not say that. The word overt is a sort of technical term connected with treason, which has come to us from the mother country, and it means an open act of rebellion. I do not see how Mr. Lincoln can do this unless he should levy war upon us. I do not therefore use the word overt. I do not intend to wait for that. But I use the word unconstitutional act, which our people understand much better, and which expresses just what I mean. But as long as he conforms to the Constitution, he should be left to exercise the duties of his office.

In giving this advice I am but sustaining the Constitution of my country, and I do not thereby become a Lincoln aid man either but a Constitutional aid man. But this matter the convention can determine.

As to the other matter, I think we have a right to pass retaliatory measures, provided they be in accordance with the Constitution of the United States, and I think they can be made such. But whether it would be wise for this Legislature to do this now is the question. To the convention, in my judgment, this matter ought to be referred. Before we commit reprisals on New England we should exhaust every means of bringing about a peaceful solution of the question.

Thus did Gen. Jackson in the case of the French. He did not recommend reprisals until he had treated with France, and got her to promise to make indemnification, and it was only on her refusal to pay the money which she had promised that he recom-

mended reprisals. It was after negotiation had failed. I do think, therefore, that it would be best, before going to extreme measures with our Confederate States, to make a presentation of our demands, to appeal to their reason and judgment to give us our rights. Then, if reason should not triumph, it will be time enough to commit reprisals, and we should be justified in the eyes of a civilized world. At least, let the States know what your grievances are, and if they refuse, as I said, to give us our rights under the Constitution of our country, I should be willing, as a last resort, to sever the ties of this Union.

My own opinion is, that if this course be pursued, and they are informed of the consequences of refusal, these States will secede; but if they should not, then let the consequences be with them, and let the responsibility of the consequences rest upon them. Another thing I would have that convention to do. Re-affirm the Georgia platform with an additional plank in it. Let that plank be the fulfillment of the obligation on the part of those States to repeal these obnoxious laws as a condition of our remaining in the Union. Give them time to consider it, and I would ask all States south to do the same thing.

I am for exhausting all that patriotism can demand before taking the last step. I would invite, therefore, South Carolina to a conference. I would ask the same of all the other Southern States, so that if the evil has got beyond our control, which God, in his mercy, grant may not be the case, let us not be divided, among ourselves, but, if possible, secure the united co-operation of all the Southern States; and then, in the face of the civilized world, we may justify our action; and, with the wrong all on the other side, we can appeal to the God of battles to aid us in our cause. But let us not do any thing in which any portion of our people may charge us with rash or hasty action. It is certainly a matter of great importance to tear this Government asunder. You were not sent here for that purpose. I would wish the whole South to be united if this is to be done; and I believe, if we pursue the policy which I have indicated, this can be effected.

In this way our sister Southern States can be induced to act with us, and I have but little doubt that the States of New York, and Pennsylvania, and Ohio, and the other Western States, will

compel their Legislatures to recede from their hostile attitudes if the others do not. Then with these we would go on without New England if she chose to stay out.

A voice in the assembly—We will kick them out.

Mr. Stephens—I would not kick them out. But if they chose to stay out, they might. I think, moreover, that these Northern States, being principally engaged in manufactures, would find that they had as much interest in the Union under the Constitution as we, and that they would return to their constitutional duty—this would be my hope. If they should not, and if the Middle States and Western States do not join us, we should at least have an undivided South. I am, as you clearly perceive, for maintaining the Union as it is, if possible. I will exhaust every means thus to maintain it with an equality in it. My principles are these:

First, the maintenance of the honor, the rights, the equality, the security, and the glory of my native State in the Union; but if these can not be maintained in the Union, then I am for their maintenance, at all hazards, out of it. Next to the honor and glory of Georgia, the land of my birth, I hold the honor and glory of our common country. In Savannah I was made to say, by the reporters—who very often make me say things which I never did say—that I was first for the glory of the whole country, and next for that of Georgia.

I said the exact reverse of this. I am proud of her history, of her present standing. I am proud even of her motto, which I would have duly respected at the present time by all her sons—Wisdom, Justice, and Moderation. I would have her rights and that of the Southern States maintained now upon these principles. Her position now is just what it was in 1850, with respect to the Southern States. Her platform then has been adopted by most, if not all, the other Southern States. Now I would add but one additional plank to that platform, which I have stated, and one which time has shown to be necessary.

If all this fails, we shall at least have the satisfaction of knowing that we have done our duty and all that patriotism could require.

ADDRESS OF E. W. GANTT, OF ARKANSAS,

(Brigadier-General in the Confederate Army)

IN FAVOR OF RE-UNION IN 1863.

FELLOW-CITIZENS :—Since the third day of June I have been a prisoner in the Federal lines.

Having but recently been through the entire South—having studied its resources, and wept over its ruin, and having become fully acquainted with its condition, and the character of its rulers, I have chosen, after long hesitation, to remain here and address you, in preference to being sent home and exchanged. I am now out of the service, and can therefore speak with unreserved freedom

My course in this struggle is known to this country. In the army and in prison, with a fire in front and in rear, I have been with you and of you so long as hope remained. And to-day I know no devotion so strong as that I bear to my Southern home, and to the masses of our people, whose terrible sufferings bind me closer to them now than ever.

I shall give you my views and counsel for what they are worth, frankly and fully in this address, and care not for the consequences to myself. It is the path of duty, and I shall follow it fearlessly.

I shall speak to you as an Arkansian—shall therefore confine myself more particularly to what has occurred in our midst since the commencement of hostilities, and may thus give a prominence, to events and persons, that they would not otherwise deserve. As I fear no one, I shall spare no one.

In the commencement of this unfortunate struggle our State hesitated ; but when the shock of arms came, she opened her treasury and poured out her best blood. Her troops were removed beyond

the Mississippi River, upon the principle that there was the place to defend her soil. We acquiesced. The principle was doubtless correct. For a time all things went well enough with us. We were only annoyed by partisan feuds and broils—by that selfish faction which so long ruled our people and left their debasing influences upon society.

But the poisoned cup had been prepared for us in the very beginning. We were destined to drain its dregs to the bottom. Our people, plundered, whipped, and oppressed, were to bow their necks to the yoke of a political adventurer, clothed in lace and brass buttons, who owed all he was to their kindness and charity. Hindman and the Johnsons—names inseparably linked with the sorrow and ruin of our people—formed a coalition and drew into it the cast-off-scum of all parties. From that day may date the ruin of our people, if not of our whole cause. Not that I intend attributing to them great force or capacity, but that circumstances of long ago, linking Hindman to Davis, and intrigue upon the part of Johnson, were to place Hindman on a larger wave than a craft of his size could ride securely. So bitter and rancorous had been the hatred of these men toward each other, that such a union, if made publicly, would have shocked and startled our people. But it was done by stealth. It leaked out by degrees.

The promotion of Captain J. B. Johnson, brother of Robert W. Johnson, in Hindman's Legion, at Hindman's instance—the urging of Hindman's promotion by Mr. Johnson in the secret and corrupt ante-chambers of Richmond politics—the appointment of Mr. Johnson's near relative on Hindman's staff—the urging of Hindman's further promotion—and, stronger and stranger than all, the procuring, by a trick of Mr. Johnson's, of the transfer of General Hindman to this Department, are cumulative evidences of this corrupt bargain—a bargain in which the blood and treasure of our people were to go to enrich the Johnsons. Hindman was to be transferred to this Department, and by his aid a great party was to be built up in our midst, and the enemies of the Johnsons put down. Having for years used the public treasure to put down foes and build up parties, now the blood of the people is to be used for the same purpose.

Mr. Davis was eager to do any thing for Hindman—would

scruple little about the means or the result to the people ; yet, in this instance, he hesitated. Mr. Johnson assured him that our people wanted Hindman here. That he was the man for the occasion. But with all this, Mr. Davis would not send him by "authority" ; yet, would permit him to be smuggled across. Our people were amazed at his advent. More so when they found that Mr. Johnson had brought him, and that the press at Little Rock, heretofore his abusers, was subservient to him. It was voiceless so far as Hindman's usurpations and oppressions might be. No other reason has ever yet been given for its mysterious silence than the prompt appointment, by Hindman, to positions of influence, of near relatives of the editors of these papers. And so the plot thickens.

In all the instances of appointees referred to in this address, I do not intend accusing them of complicity with the leaders, and may as well say so here.

When Hindman came here we had no army on our soil—nor indeed any hostile army threatening us. [This needs modification. But the threat had passed before the army was organized.] The policy of the Confederate authorities had been announced. It was that no more regiments should be organized, but that all men liable to military duty should be enrolled in regiments then existing. This policy was in the way of Hindman's building up, for himself and the Johnsons, a great array of satellites, by the "appointing power." Therefore, in the teeth of this policy, and disregarding authority, he organized and officered some forty regiments. The poor soldier could not choose his own officer. He might not choose what would be regarded as Johnson-Hindman material. But the creation and continued existence of an officer, as such, depended upon Hindman's breath alone. It remained now to be seen what one, who had crawled in the dirt before the people, when he wanted place, would do when he held supreme power.

Among the first acts was to declare martial law all over the State, and to appoint patrols of ten, with a captain, in each township—a new military organization of his own creation. Among their duties was to assist in arresting and imprisoning, without charge or complaint, the suspected freemen of Arkansas. And many a poor creature, thus torn from home and family, died in a loathsome prison, or perished by the wayside. Would you believe

it, my fellow-citizens, that two or three lines from Hindman or one of his subordinates has been all the commitment upon which respectable citizens, with their heads shorn, have lingered a year in the penitentiary, treated as ordinary convicts? The records are in the city of Little Rock.

But this is not all. He plundered our people most mercilessly. Anarchy and despotism vied in their reign. His Commissary Department was so miserably managed that, with an abundant country to draw and collect supplies from, it was so neglected, that, I am told, in many instances he took bread from the mouths of helpless women and children, whose only stay and support had perished by disease or the bayonet. He assumed to regulate prices. By this arbitrary and tyrannical means he caused great suffering, and afforded increased facilities for the growth of fraud and crime, while all honest men were well nigh impoverished. He ordered cotton to be burned in regions remote from navigation, and where an army will never tread, and where, if it should come, it could not more than transport supplies, much less haul cotton. And he sent brutal, rough men to execute these orders. If a citizen complained, he was snubbed, plundered, or imprisoned. Oftener all of these things. Of all these things Jeff. Davis was duly informed.

When long absence and tales of distress, coming from the plundered homes of toil-worn soldiers, impelled them, from impulses not to be despised, to force their way home, to stop the cries of suffering babes and soothe the sorrows of heart-broken wives, with the intention of again returning to their command, he has not waited their return, but treated them as deserters, had them hunted with negro dogs, and when caught, executed with a fiendishness alike cruel and shocking to humanity.

He has, I am told, appointed military commissions which should keep no records, and from their midnight recesses spoken away the lives of citizen and soldier. In one instance this mysterious and worse than Jesuitical tribunal condemned, to six months' imprisonment, a citizen of our State. With a stroke of his pen he raised the penalty to capital punishment, and the victim was accordingly executed. What the supposed offender did, what he was accused of doing, there is no written record left. Voltaire says that in Africa, tyrants who execute with their own hands criminals condemned to death, are justly called barbarians. He would be puzzled for a name for the tryant in this instance.

In other cases he is said to have caused men to be executed without trial, and even to have witnessed their execution. In others, again, he is said to have seized citizens and put them upon trial before military tribunals, and had them executed. In one instance, the offense being Unionism, it was ascertained, after trial and sentence, that the supposed offender was a good Southern man. A pardon from Hindman was started, but the bearer only reached there in time to see the lifeless form of the murdered man being borne from the desecrated spot of his execution. Of all these things Jefferson Davis was duly informed.

The story of the two young Texas soldiers I have often heard, and never heard it contradicted. They were twin brothers—young, handsome, and sprightly. Having just entered the service, and from a State noted for its peculiar ideas of personal freedom, they supposed that a few days' absence from camp without leave would subject them to nothing more than a slight camp punishment. And having relatives a few miles in the country, whom they had not seen for years, they concluded to visit them. Poor fellows! Hindman was fresh from Bragg! They were hunted down, summarily tried, convicted, and the sentence approved in one day. The young men, in person, urged their youth and inexperience as an excuse, and begged him to let them live, assuring him they would show him, if spared, what soldiers they could make. Their gray-haired sire, bearing about his person the marks of wounds received at the Alamo and upon the battle-fields of Mexico, with breaking heart bowed before him and craved pardon for his thoughtless and innocent boys. And women, struck with their youth and innocence, with tears and entreaties implored mercy for the unfortunate youths. But in vain. The tyrant was inexorable. The noble youths fell, after a tender and touching farewell, victims to the ambition of one who was misled by the cruelty of Bragg, and who, in adopting the latter's style of discipline, took up the club of Hercules, and so, not being able to wield it, degenerated into a mere murderer.

He turned the Indians against us—thus leaving us defenseless, and threatened by a savage foe in the West, besides the loss of that whole territory. There was but one man on the continent who could control them. Nature, education, habits, and appearance, had peculiarly fitted him for the task. That man was Gen.

Albert Pike. He should have been permitted to remain there. Hindman and Johnson intrigued him out. Mr. Davis preferred risking the loss of that country, and our ruin, to the loss of his pet. He even permitted General Pike to be dragged through the country, like a common culprit, between a file of soldiers! What hope had a poor down-trodden citizen, when a general officer, and he one of the first men of the nation, could be thus treated with impunity at the instance of one of Davis' creatures? Of all these things Jefferson Davis was informed.

But our people, in the soreness of their agony, and from the depths of their oppression, petitioned Mr. Davis for relief. Month after month rolled by and no response. Still, month after month they groaned, and suffered, and supplicated. Their appeals for relief fell upon leaden ears. And while the people suffered, the Johnsons and Hindmans feasted and flourished, and were glad. But at last the current of agony and complaint was too great. The tardy response came. And what, oh, my suffering countrymen, do you suppose that response is? It is that "Hindman is there without authority." What a terrible retribution we had a right to expect. The least we could hope—had his acts been done by one here by authority—would be that he would meet removal and prompt punishment—and surely, that one who, here, "without authority," had robbed, pillaged, and destroyed—oppressed and murdered, and crushed the very life out of our people, would be put upon his trial as a culprit, and meet a felon's doom. We shall see.

In amazement, you would ask me if Mr. Davis knew of these things. All of them. Besides what private citizens all over the State had written him, General Pike, in written charges and in powerful published pamphlets, made most of it known to him and the world. But R. W. Johnson and his followers are supreme at Richmond. He owns the whole representation from this State, except Mr. Garland, who has all the sense and manliness of the concern. Verily, the "vessel of State must have been violently agitated, or such foul dregs could never have risen to the top!"

One Hanly did venture to whisper in his own room, with locked doors, to a few citizens, about these outrages; but he locked their mouths with a pledge of secresy before they left, lest "Bob Johnson" should think he had turned traitor to him. And poor old

Mitchel would talk so much on both sides, that, as usual, he neutralized what he said, while Mr. Garland's utterances were stifled between affection on the part of Davis for Hindman, and subserviency to Mr. Johnson. The latter gentleman will not desert Hindman yet. The harvest of place and power reaped by them is too great to lose. Better the people groan and suffer. So, after all his wickedness, Hindman is still to remain here. But to soothe the public, and blind it, a new man must be brought over—one they can use, of course. Mr. Johnson finds him—a weak, superannuated old creature, who was made "Lieutenant-General Holmes" for this express command—the interests of Arkansas being subordinated to that of the Johnsons, and to the hate of Mr. Davis—for our poor oppressed people demanded General Price—or rather, begged for him piteously, our days for "demanding" having passed.

The acts of this poor, unfortunate, and pitiable old man are known to all. Our people breathed free for a moment after he came—for, the press here belonging to the coalition, he was eulogized excessively. But they soon saw the stroke of Hindman's hand in all his acts. As General Pike justly remarks, his lieutenant became his master. Holmes revoked none of Hindman's odious orders, and the terrible scenes of oppression and plunder went on as before.

With all this our people were still willing to suffer and to bleed, if any military results favorable to us might flow from it. Our hopes were disappointed. Military affairs were neglected. Johnson and Hindman were intent on keeping up political prestige, and even induced poor old General Holmes to use the influence of his rank and gold lace upon weak members of the Legislature in the election for Confederate Senator. Thus the time was passed in feasting and dancing, and political wire-working, while the poor soldier shivered under the bleak sky, and the poor citizen groaned under oppression and wrong, and trembled lest the last morsel should at any moment be taken from his helpless family.

General Holmes had no plan of campaign, no conception of his duties, and not manliness and honesty enough to give way to a better.

While this state of affairs existed I addressed a letter to Mr. Davis, as follows:

"SIR, if something is not done for Arkansas, we are ruined. Our people have been terribly oppressed. They are yet. They need relief. They want General Price. Send him, and he will winter in Missouri with sixty thousand men. If you don't, this Department is gone, and Arkansas must and will seek protection elsewhere.

"General Holmes has no plan of campaign. Hindman is in the North-west, with some fifteen thousand men. But the centre, under Roane and a few other stupid political appointees of Hon. R. W. Johnson, is too far off to support him. The centre, in turn, can not be supported by the right under Hindman, or the left, under Churchill, at Arkansas Post—while the latter place, if attacked, can not be supported, and must fall. Besides, General C., although a good soldier, is, in my opinion, incompetent to the command. I speak of these things as against offensive movements upon the part of the enemy. As for offensive movements upon our part, General Holmes has undertaken none. Nor does he even contemplate it. If our troops remain here, they ought to go into Missouri at once.

"But, as I said in my last letter, all the soldiers on this side the river, except about five thousand mounted men, to keep out marauding bands, ought to be sent across the Mississippi River, for every man sent from this side the river forces the Federals to send one to meet him. Thus Arkansas would be relieved of a friendly and hostile army both. Then, holding Vicksburgh and its approaches, in the meantime, and our people being left free to sow and reap in peace, we can supply the whole army on the east side of the river. But, by all means, send Price here, and let him go into Missouri. He would be received with the wildest enthusiasm. If he is not sent, we are ruined.

"I know that certain politicians from our State talk differently. They either don't know what they talk about, or are subserving some selfish ends at the cost of the people. I know that I have long been the victim of petty partisan intrigue there; but, as having been the chosen representative of half the people of Arkansas in the Federal Congress, and as that verdict has never been set aside by them, I have the right to speak, and do, in their name and behalf, most solemnly urge these views upon you. I beseech you not to listen alone to politicians, who, repudiated

and kicked out of power in 1860, were so unmanly as to crawl back into like places when the country was in arms. I beseech you not to let their selfishness be our ruin. While I would scorn to ask this for myself, I can do so cheerfully for my people.

"This letter, for the present, I desire should be considered as private and confidential. Your obedient servant,

"E. W. GANTT.

"His Excellency JEFFERSON DAVIS."

My appeals did not even elicit a response. Time wore on. My predictions proved true. Hindman was defeated at Prairie Grove. His shattered columns, over snow and ice, half clad and half fed, wound their toilsome way back to Little Rock. About five thousand went home by force. Churchill was attacked at Arkansas Post; but, being cut off from the hope of succor, the place was surrendered after a feeble resistance. Mr. Davis had been warned time and again of these dangers. But Hindman was his pet and protégé. Sending Price would interfere with Hindman, and would likewise give opportunity for distinction to a man he hated. This noble and good old man, who is a statesman and a soldier, has been meanly and malignantly disparaged and oppressed by Mr. Davis since the commencement of the war.

Our people, after these reverses, were more disheartened than ever. They clamored for Hindman's removal and trial. General Pike preferred the charges, and went to Richmond in person to prosecute them. But Mr. Davis smuggled Hindman back on the other side of the river, and gave him the dignified and appropriate position of president of a court of inquiry, to investigate the conduct of one other pet of his, General Mansfield Lovell, who so ingloriously surrendered New Orleans—commencing in Louisiana what Hindman completed in Arkansas. But, as if to add insult to injury, Mr. Davis at last "indorses" openly the acts of Hindman, and, to add to your shame and humiliation, gives him command of a division in Bragg's army. Humanity stands appalled, and reason aghast, at such acts of perfidy, baseness, and cruelty.

Oh, my countrymen, your suffering has been indescribable—inconceivable! We thought we were fighting for constitutional liberty, when a tyrant was most mercilessly treading that constitution

under his feet by every act of outrage and oppression that a conquered people can feel. And, after nearly two years of strife, we awaken, from a fearful baptism of blood, to the terrible truth that the shadow of the despotism which we fled from, under Mr. Lincoln, dissolves into nothingness compared to the awful reign of tyranny that we have groaned under at the hands of Jefferson Davis and his minions. Will we profit by such awakening? It remains to be seen.

The army that Hindman raised and officered here, against authority, and "without authority," has, by disease, death, and desertion, dwindled to a mere handful of men. The same material, if it had never been thus organized, or if, after organization, it had been sent to Bragg as he entered Kentucky, would have enabled him to be on the Ohio line to-day. It certainly could have held Vicksburgh and its approaches, if assigned to that duty. Hence I said, in the early part of this address, that not only the ruin of our State, but of our cause, might be attributed to Hindman and the Johnsons. The forty thousand men sacrificed to their ambition could have turned the scale in any State—any Department.

But with all our sufferings and sorrows, we had hopes of success and better things while Vicksburgh held out. But Mr. Davis had a pet appointee here. His narrow stubbornness and great vanity would not permit him to remove Pemberton, because such removal would be an admission that Mr. Davis was wrong. Rather the people suffer than such admission. Pemberton was a bad appointment—clearly incompetent. Possessing the confidence of neither citizen nor soldier, and Mr. Davis cognizant of it, he was still retained in command. He lost Vicksburgh. In his Department were sixty thousand troops when General Grant undertook the bold and hazardous plan of running our batteries at Vicksburgh, and marching inland. with less than fifty thousand men for duty.

Contrary to all military science and experience, Pemberton scatters instead of massing his forces. He leaves a weakened force, at Port Hudson, flanked on both sides—reduces the garrison at Vicksburgh, and leaves small forces at Raymond, Grand Gulf, Jackson, Yazoo City, and other points away up in Mississippi. General Grant was thus enabled, with his columns massed, to whip him in detail.

After the repulse at Grand Gulf—which forty thousand men on the defensive could have prevented, and which were in Pemberton's Department—and the flight from Raymond, General Joe Johnston was sent to assume command. That noble officer, despised by Davis, and not even spoken to by that mercenary wretch, Benjamin—who controls, by indirection Davis and Cabinet—cheerfully repaired to Jackson. Arrived there, he is said to have shed tears over the hopelessness of affairs and the splendid opportunity lost. You are familiar with the rest—our appalling loss at Edward's Depot, and the fall of Vicksburgh and Port Hudson with their brave defenders. Thus, with the loss of friends and relatives, came the blighting of your last hopes. And all to gratify the narrow obstinacy, mean selfishness, and personal hate and vindictiveness of Jefferson Davis and Judah P. Benjamin. Thus Arkansas was cut off from all chance of protection, if hope thereof she ever had. And thus stands the case to-day.

This gentleman has proven himself totally unsuited to the emergency. With the whole cotton crop and wealth of the South at his disposal, and the friendship of many European Powers, he has accomplished nothing abroad. His foreign policy has been a stupid failure. He has permitted himself to be over-reached and out-managed in every thing. His policy at home, while proving him to be strong in some respects, has shown him to be weak, mean, and malignant in others. He is cold, selfish, and supremely ambitious, and, under the cover of outward sanctity and patriotism, flows concealed the strongest vein of hypocrisy and demagogism.

He has never been up to the magnitude of the undertaking. He refused troops for the war in May, A.D. 1861, because he did not "know that they would be needed." His idea at first seems to have been that hostilities would soon cease, and he bent his energies for a cheap war. His preparations and outfit were accordingly contracted and parsimonious. Awakened to a sense of his error, his next aim seems to have been to conquer his foes and put down every man that had crossed his pathway in life. The latter succeeded at all events. Instances of this are numerous; but that of Senator Brown—the peer of Mr. Davis in every thing, his superior in many, and his rival and successful competitor for the United States Senate—is pointed. He joined a company in Da-

vis' army, and was elected captain. He had capacity for any position. Yet Mr. Davis, not looking to the public interest, but to the gratification of his own private feelings, sees this opportunity to strike an old rival, and embraces it. He refused him all promotion, and left him the alternative of wearing himself out as captain of a company, or seeking position elsewhere. Mr. Brown's election to the Confederate Senate terminated the matter.

He drove General Gustavus W. Smith from the army. He was once ready to remove Stonewall Jackson, and only the success of the latter, backed by a powerful and excited party, prevented it. He over-slaughed and oppressed Beauregard because he let the people know that he desired to move on Washington, at once, after the first Manassas fight, and was prevented by Davis. He drove General Walker, of Georgia, out of the service. He retained Hindman, in Arkansas, with a positve knowledge of his outrages. He removed him but to endorse his acts. He retains Holmes here, to gratify the Johnsons, at the ruin of our people. He has pursued and oppressed General Price, because, I suppose, the latter was made a brigadier in Mexico, and Davis was not. He retained Pemberton in command against the wishes of the army and the country, and, to add insult to it all, sends him to Mobile to take command, where he is execrated by every man, woman, and child. By a trick and a swindle he got General J. E. Johnston away from his command in Virginia, and gave him no other definite position until there was a pressing emergency, and a chance to damage him—thereby showing both his want of confidence in him and his malignity towards him. He drove General Pike out of the army to gratify Hindman and the Johnsons, and thereby lost to us the whole Indian country, and, if the war continues, will place the tomahawk and scalping knife at the throats of our women and children. He retains a weak and inefficient cabinet, and never calls them in council, that he may reign as sole despot over our people. He has had at his disposal physical force enough to carry out acts the most arbitrary and oppressive. He has used that force. He has shown his selfishness and disregard for the interest of the people by his appointment of Heath, Van Dorn, Dick Taylor, Davis, and Mansfield Lovell—all relatives of his, and all alike incompetent. He has alienated the people of Georgia—so much so, that were the Confederacy acknowledged to-day, Georgia

would not remain two years under him. I heard a Confederate General of great prominence, who understands the feeling in that State, so declare. And, as significant of this, Governor Brown, of Georgia, gave to General G. W. Smith, meanly and spitefully driven out of the army by Davis, the presidency of the Etowah iron works, with a salary larger than that of his salary as Lieutenant-General. He falsified all his promises to Kentucky, and took General Humphrey Marshall's command away from him, turning it over to his old political rival, General Preston, to gratify the partisan requirements of Kentucky citizens who had suddenly risen from the obscure position of pork packers to that of Senators and Representatives in the Confederate Congress, and jugglers in that political Sodom. In a word, he has enriched and honored his friends, ruined and impoverished his enemies. Has given over the people, those of Arkansas especially, to plunder and oppression by his favorites, and in no instance punished the offender. I admit that in some things he looms up above other men; but he has so many defects and weaknesses beneath others, that it reduces him to a very poor second-rate character. And you can never change him. His life has been warped by political intrigue. His prejudices have been narrowed and his hates embittered by years of partisan strife. And you had as well take the oak which has been bent while a twig and beat upon by the storms of centuries, when its boughs are falling off and its trunk decaying, and attempt to straighten it up toward Heaven, as to attempt the straightening of a character so warped and bent by years of political storm and intrigue.

What shall we do? This question naturally comes up after all that has preceded. If Mr. Davis, when he held the lives and fortunes of many millions in his hands, so blundered as to lose his opportunity, what can we hope from him now that a scene of blackness, of anguish and desolation reigns where wealth, happiness, and plenty smiled? If he would not protect Arkansas when he could, but, instead, gave it over to oppression and plunder by his pets, what have we to hope now that he trembles in Richmond for his own safety, and wakes up at last to the terrible reality of his folly, weakness, and indiscretion? If we were not protected when we could have been, and if we can not now be protected, what must we do? Some say continue the struggle. Let the last man die, etc.

I think differently. We ought to end the struggle and submit. But you say, it is humiliating. No more than to surrender when whipped. We have done that often—always where we could do no better. I have tried the experiment twice, and found it by no means foolish. Submission is but surrender. We are fairly beaten in the whole result, and should at once surrender the point.

If we don't get the happiness we enjoyed in the old government, we can get no more misery than we have felt under Jefferson Davis. But I look for peace there. We had it many years. Even while we are arrayed against it, I find that hostile forces in our midst give more protection to citizens than they had when Holmes and Hindman were here. It is true the Johnsons tell you that General Steele has imprisoned and oppressed people here. Not a word of truth in it. And they know it is all false. In a few months, when no more Confederate money can be invested, and nothing more made out of the people, they will sneak back and claim his protection.

But we are whipped—fairly beaten. Our armies are melting, and ruin approaches us. Will continuing this struggle help us? Every battle we might gain ought to wring tears from the hearts of Southern men! We are just that much weaker—that much nearer our final ruin. Anguish and sorrow and desolation meet us wherever we turn. The longer the struggle the more of it.

Don't let yourselves be deceived with the hope that the United States will abandon the struggle. They can never do it. They have toiled and spent too much to see the solution of the problem, and not foot up the figures. They scarcely feel the war at home. Their cities are more populous and thrifty to-day than ever. For every man who dies, or gets killed in battle, two emigrate to the country. Their villages and towns, their fields and country flourish as fresh as ever. They could sink their armies to-day, and raise new levies to crush us and not feel it.

How is it with us? The last man is in the field. Half our territory overrun. Our cities gone to wreck, peopled alone by the aged, the lame and halt, and women and children; while deserted towns, and smoking ruins, and plantations abandoned and laid waste, meet us on all sides, and anarchy and ruin, disappointment and discontent lower over all the land.

You rely upon foreign intervention. Alas, and alas! How many lives, hopes, and fortunes have been buried under this fatal delusion! It has held us on to a hopeless struggle while the belt of desolation has girdled us closer, and the sea of anguish and sorrow risen higher, flushed with the tears of ruined and bereaved ones. France will not interfere. Louis Napoleon has at heart the building of the transit route connecting the two oceans. If he can keep up this struggle until that is accomplished, the star of England's ascendency on the ocean goes out before him, and the whole commercial world becomes subsidiary to him. To keep up this struggle he will delude us continually with false hopes, recking nothing how much we bleed and suffer. I even suspect the pretended loans to us in France rest upon a policy of this sort, and that he is at the bottom of it.

But if Louis Napoleon does propose to interfere and take us under his "protection," what then? Another Maximilian for us—for Americans! "Forbid it my countrymen! Forbid it heaven!" Our fathers threw off colonial dependence upon a European crowned head! It would be ignominous in us to go back a half century and more to accept what they freed us from. Much less to risk a despot over us. So eager are some of our leaders for this interference that I am told it is proposed to give Napoleon Texas as a bonus for his good graces and his kindly aid! And the "Lone Star" may be handed over by Davis at any moment, so far as he can do it. The thought ought to make the blood of every American citizen mount to his cheek. Whenever this is attempted I shall be one to meet the legions of France, under the old flag, to battle for the sacredness and safety of republican institutions. But suppose he offers recognition alone? It is a barren offering. Suppose he offers it coupled with assistance? It comes too late. *Timeo Danaos munera ferentes!* No more dangerous and destructive alliance, in our prostrate condition, could be formed, however eagerly we might, at first, have grasped it. For, even if we should succeed with his aid—and the struggle would be as doubtful as terrible (and he would abandon us at any moment), the French empire of Mexico, right at our doors, would swallow up Cuba and all the contiguous islands, and absorb that part of Mexico that we, as a nation, would hope to get. And the day we settle deliberately a monarchy on this side of the ocean, we prepare

crowns for kings and fetters for the people on every foot of ground upon the American continent. But, as I said, there will be no interference.

Have no hopes from a divided North. It is on the surface—scarcely goes to the bottom of their polities, much less shaking the great masses of their determined people. Remember, too, that much of the South is with them. There is no division so far as fighting us is concerned. The mildest of them simply propose peace by reconstruction. That rejected, they are to press us with redoubled energy. Let us not, after all our misfortunes, construe the struggle between politicians for place into a sympathy for ourselves. But how could they propose peace? Who would bring the message? To whom would it be delivered? And should the proposition be made and rejected, we are that much worse off for it. We must propose peace, for we ought to know when we have got enough of the thing.

Do not rely upon splitting up our army, and adopting the Guerrilla mode of warfare. It will contribute nothing to the general result and only entail more suffering. If practiced behind the Federal lines, it subdues our own people. It converts many of our soldiers into robbers and plunderers, and brings down, oftentimes, terrible retribution upon the heads of our citizens. What does the shooting of a few friends and foes on a railroad train amount to? And your own friends, as prisoners, going or returning, are on nearly all of them. In order to shoot a citizen or soldier opposed to you, you risk taking the life of a relative, a friend, or perhaps a brother soldier, who, having lingered long in prison, is returning with his sad heart full of home and loved ones.

And then to fire upon steamboats. It is dangerous to your friends—unmanly and unsoldierly in the extreme. Before a city is fired upon, it is the duty of the commanding officer to give his adversary reasonable notice to remove the women, children and non-combatants. Steamboats always have more or less of this class of people on board. A single shot may destroy a steamboat with all its passengers. How much stronger, then, the reason not to fire upon it until a like notice is served?

A few days since a Confederate officer was aboard a transport with his family. The boat was fired upon by guerillas. He stepped forward and entreated the party not to fire, that their

friends were on board. A ball entered his heart, and his widow and orphans are in the care of strangers. He was the only person touched.

On the boat that transported us were the wives, sisters, and mothers of Missouri soldiers, who had left home and country to join their husbands and relatives in the Southern army. How terrible was the thought which often occurred to me on our trip, that the ball of the guerilla, in the foolish hope of killing a foe, might go to the heart of his homeless wife, then throbbing with anxiety to be once more pressed to his manly bosom. And this is a constant danger. Not a boat but contains more or less of these people.

But this mode of warfare, while contributing nothing toward the general result, breaks up the peace of communities. It has never whipped an army; never retarded its progress; never cut off its supplies, nor interfered materially with its operations. It recoils upon us invariably. For instance, we fall back before the enemy. Our family is left in his lines. The country around them has been devastated. The United States authorities permit the bringing of supplies. We fire upon their transports. No more supplies come, and our families are left on the verge of starvation. This thing has occurred both in Tennessee and Arkansas. I implore all of our citizens within the Federal lines to remain at home and keep quiet. Let West Tennessee be a warning to you. Long since, that country would have been quiet and the people recovering from their losses, had it not been infested with guerillas, who, abandoning warfare, have plundered friend and foe, and kept life and property insecure. Indeed, a detailed account of their acts would be sickening and disgusting in the extreme. As the federal army advances through Arkansas let the sunlight of peace be behind it, however dark and threatening the cloud ahead. If we do not robbers and freebooters will take posession of our soil, and soon depopulate and convert it into a waste.

I am asked if Mr. Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation will stand. If you continue the struggle, certainly. He has the physical force at his disposal to carry it out. If you cease now, you may save all in your hands, or compromise on gradual emancipation. But let, I beseech you, the negro no longer stand in the way of the happiness and safety of friends and kindred.

The changes of sentiment upon this question in the South have been curious. Not many years since it was by no means unusual for the press and public men, as well as for the people generally in the South, to concede that slavery was an evil, and regret that it should ever have existed; expressing, however, no disposition or desire to be rid of it. Yet, a few years more—the demand for cotton having increased, the price of negroes having advanced, and the agitation of the slavery question having increased in virulence—finds us defending slavery as a divine institution. *DeBow's Review*, and other Southern papers and periodicals, with Senator Hammond, of South Carolina, were prominent in this defence. Their object was to educate the Southern mind to this belief. Such a course had become vital to the existence of slavery; because, to concede that negro slavery was morally wrong, was virtually to concede the whole argument to the Abolitionists. As the controversy warmed we became sensitive, and so morbidly so, that the North might have threatened with impunity to deprive us of horses, or other property—yet the whole South would be ablaze if some fanatic took one negro. Such was the public sentiment South at the commencement of this most unfortunate and bloody struggle. But revolutions shake up men's thoughts and put them in different channels. I have recently talked with Southern slaveholders from every State. They are tired of negro slavery, and believe they could make more clear money, and live more peaceably without than with it. As for the non-slaveholder of the South, I honestly thought the struggle was for him more than for his wealthy neighbor. That to free the negro would reduce to comparative slavery the poor white man. I now regret, that instead of a war to sustain slavery, it had not been a struggle at the ballot box to colonise it. This will clearly be the next struggle.

I am of opinion that, whether it is a divine institution or not, negro slavery has accomplished its mission here. A great mission it had. A new and fertile country had been discovered and must be made useful. The necessities of mankind pressed for its speedy development. Negro slavery was the instrument to effect this. It alone could open up the fertile and miasmatic regions of the South, solving the problem of their utility, which no theorist could have reached. It was the magician which suddenly revolu-

tionized the commerce of the world by the solution of this problem. It peopled and made opulent the barren hills of New England, and threw its powerful influence across the great North-west. Standing as a wall between the two sections, it caught and rolled northward the wealth and population of the Old World, and held in their places the restless adventurers of New England, or turned them along the great prairies and valleys of the West. Thus New England reached its climax, and the North-west was overgrown of its age, while the South, with its negro laborers, was sparsely settled and comparatively poor. Thus slavery had done its utmost for New England and the North-west, and was a weight upon the South. If, at this point, its disappearance could have clearly commenced, what untold suffering and sorrow might have been avoided.

Its existence had become incompatible with the existence of the Government. For, while it had stood as a wall, damming up the current and holding back the people and laborers of the North, it had, by thus precluding free intercourse between the sections, produced a marked change in their manners, customs, and sentiments, and the two sections were growing more divergent every day. This wall, or the Government—one must give way. The shock came which was to settle the question. I thought that the Government was divided, and negro slavery established forever. I erred. The Government was stronger than slavery. Re-union is certain, but not more certain than the downfall of slavery. As I have said, the mission of the latter is accomplished. And, as his happiness must always be subordinated to that of the white man, he must, ere long, depart on the foot-prints of the red man, whose mission being accomplished, is fast fading from our midst.

While I think the mission of the negro is accomplished here, I am clearly of the opinion that the time will come when civilization and learning shall light up the dark abodes of the four hundred million people in India, and when their wants and necessities will put the patient and hardy negro to toiling, and opening up the great valley of the fertile but miasmatic America. But such speculations are out of place here.

Let us, fellow citizens, endeavor to be calm. Let us look these new ideas and our novel position squarely in the face. We fought for negro slavery. We have lost. We may have to do without

it. The inconvenience will be great for a while—the loss heavy. This, however, is already well nigh accomplished. Yet behind this dark cloud is a silver lining, if not for us, at least for our children. In the place of these bondsmen will come an immense influx of people from all parts of the world, bringing with them their wealth, arts, and improvements, and lending their talents and sinews to increase our aggregate wealth. Thrift, and trade, and a common destiny will bind us together. Machinery in the hills of Arkansas will reverberate to the music of machinery in New England, and the whir of Georgia spindles will meet responsive echoes upon the slopes of the far off Pacific. Protective tariffs, if needed, will stretch in their influence from the Lakes to the Gulf, and from ocean to ocean, bearing alike, at last, equally upon Arkansian and Vermonter, and upon Georgian and Californian. Differences of section and sentiment will wear away and be forgotten, and the next generation be more homogeneous and united than any since the days of the Revolution. And the descendants of these bloody times will read, with as much pride and as little jealousy, of these battles of their fathers, as the English and Scotch descendants of the heroes of Flodden Field read of their ancestral achievements in the glowing lines of Scott, or, as the descendants of Highland and Lowland chiefs, allusions to their fathers' conflicts in the simple strains of the rustic Burns.

Let us live in hope, my grief-stricken brothers, that the day is not far distant when Arkansas will rise from the ashes of her desolation, to start on a path of higher destiny, than, with negro slavery, she ever could have reached; while the reunited Government, freed from this cankering sore, will be more vigorous and powerful, and more thrifty, opulent and happy, than though the scourge of war had never desolated her fields, or made sorrowful her hearthstones!

The sooner we lay down our arms and quit this hopeless struggle, the sooner our days of prosperity will return.

I hesitated long, my fellow citizens, before I determined to issue this address. I dislike to be abused and slandered. But, more than all, dislike to live under a cloud with those friends who have not yet reached my stand-point—and, besides, all I possess is in the Confederate lines. Their leaders will deprive my family of slaves, home, property, debts due me—in a word, reduce them from

competence and ease to penury. Aside from what I have inside the Confederate lines, I could not pay for the paper this address is written upon. But it may all go. Did I desire future promotion, and could bring my conscience to it, I would do like the Johnsons; safe from bullets and hardships themselves, they assist in holding you on to this hopeless and ruinous struggle, and at the end of the conflict will come back and say:—"I staid with you to the last!" "Honor me and mine." God deliver me from such traitors to humanity and to the interests of our bleeding people! To me the path of duty is plain. It is to lend my feeble aid to stop this useless effusion of blood. And though it beggars my family, and leaves me no ray of hope for the future, I shall follow it.

I have witnessed the desolation of the Southern States from one end to the other. This hopeless struggle but widens it. Each day makes new graves, new orphans, and new mourners. Each hour flings into this dreadful whirlpool more of wretched hopes, broken fortunes, and anguished hearts. The rich have mostly fallen. The poor have drunk deep of the cup of sorrow, while surely, and not slowly, the tide of ruin, in its resistless surge, sweeps toward the middle classes. A few more compaigns and they will form part of the general wreck. Each grave and each tear, each wasted fortune and broken heart, puts us that much further off from the object of the struggle, and that much further off from peace and happiness.

Viewing it thus, the terrible question was presented to me, as to whether I should continue my lot in an enterprise so fruitless and so full of woe, and help hold the masses of the people on to this terrible despotism of Davis, where only ruin awaits them; or whether I should be a quiet observer of it all; or, lastly, whether I should assist in saving the remnant of you from the wreck.

I have chosen the latter. I shall send this address to every hill and corner of the State, to the citizen and soldier—at home or in prison, and shall send with it my prayers, to Almighty God, to arrest them in their pathway of blood and ruin. Why trust Davis longer. Had he twice our present resources, he would still fail. With success he would be a despot. But the whole thing is tumbling to pieces. Soldiers are leaving disgusted and disheartened, and whole States have gone back to their homes in the national galaxy; Maryland and Delaware will never again be shaken. Ken.

tucky has intrenched herself in the Union behind a wall of bayonets in the hands of her own sturdy sons. Missouri is as firmly set in the national galaxy as Massachusetts. Tennessee, tempest-tossed and bolt riven, under the guidance of her great pilot, steers for her old mooring, and will be safely anchored before the leaves fall; while the rays of light from the old North State, flashing out fitfully from her darkness accross the troubled waves, show that she stirs, is not lost, but is struggling to rejoin her sisters. None of these States will ever join the South again. Then, with crippled armies, with devastated fields—with desolate cities, with disheartened soldiers, and, worse than all, with weak and corrupt leaders, what hope is left to the few remaining States, but especially to poor, oppressed, and down-trodden Arkansas? None! Better get our brothers home while they are left to us. Open the way for the return of husbands, fathers and sons, and bind up the broken links of the old Union. The people must act to do this. I tell you now, in grief and pain, that the leaders don't care for your blood. Your sufferings move them not. The tears and wails of your anguished and bereaved ones fall on hearts of flint. While they can make a dollar, or wear an epaulet, they are content. Finally, with a grief-stricken and sorrowful heart, I implore mothers, sisters, wives, and daughters, to assist, by all their arts, in saving their loved ones from this terrible scourge, ere ruin overtakes you and them irretrievably. While God gives me strength, daunted by no peril, and swerved by no consideration of self, I shall give you my feeble aid.

To break the force of these utterances, honestly, patriotically and sorrowfully made, the Johnsons and certain reptiles who crawl around Little Rock, under Federal protection, together with all other like men, who, from their own innate corruption, are not able to appreciate pure motives in others, will tell you that a desire to go to Congress has influenced my conduct. Do they suppose that I would lose the last dollar I have, and subject myself to their slander and abuse for the chance of running for an office when peace is made? Does not my refusing, upon principle, to take my seat in Congress in 1860, after a triumphant election, in which I carried twenty-two out of twenty-eight counties, show them what little value I set upon such a bauble? But I will stop their mouths by the solemn assurance that there are not people

enough on the continent to induce me to go to Congress. I am sick, tired and disgusted with public life? Peace? peace, and the safety of what is left of our noble and suffering people, is my only ambition! We must bear in mind, too, as we go along, that in conceding the chance of a "Congress," they acknowledge the failure of the Confederate cause.

The shortest way, in my opinion, to resume our relations with the Federal government, is to instruct Hon. W. K. Sebastian to take his seat in the United States Senate. It is by all means desirable that such instructions be so clear that the United States Government may be at no loss to see that our people are loyal, and that Mr. Sebastian may have but one course of conduct left. I feel sure that he will respond favorably to your wishes.

Whenever it can be done, meetings should be held promptly, instructing him to resume his seat in the Senate. Where it can not be done, or where citizens can not attend meetings, let them get up petitions to that effect. The proceedings of such meetings, and the petitions, if sent to me, at this place, will receive prompt attention. We should do all this before the meeting of Congress in December. We will have trade open, and get all the other benefits of a government that much sooner.

I must publicly acknowledge, here, my regret for the strong terms of disapprobation I used toward that distinguished gentleman, Hon. W. K. Sebastian, for his refusal to join us in this struggle.

To those who differed from me in the commencement of this rebellion—the extent and bloodiness of which no mortal could foresee—I must say, that developments show that you were right and I wrong. But let bygones be forgotten, and let us all unite to bring about peace, and to lure our lost Pleiad from her wanderings, that she may again sparkle in our nation's coronet of stars.

Your fellow citizen,

E. W. GANTT.

LITTLE ROCK, October 7, 1863.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 37.

How the South Rejected Compromise in the Peace Conference of 1861.

SPEECH OF MR. CHASE,

OF OHIO.

Published from the Notes of a Member.

DEFEAT OF COMPROMISE IN 1861.

The history of the *Peace Conference*, which assembled at Washington in February, 1861, under an invitation from Virginia, has never been written.

The Legislatures of Kentucky and Illinois had recommended to Congress to call a Convention to consider the circumstances of the country, and to propose such amendments to the Constitution, if any, as might be found necessary to harmonize the relations of the States and their citizens.

It will be remembered by those who have read the published journal of the Convention, that the Committee on Propositions and Resolutions proposed certain amendments to the Constitution, embodied in a new article of seven sections, to be called the Thirteenth.

The *first* section provided for the division of all the existing territory of the United States into Slave and Free Territory by the line of 36° 30′; the *second* prohibited new acquisitions of territory without the concurrence of a majority of all the Senators from Slave States and a majority of all the Senators from

Free States; the *third* prohibited Congress from interfering with Slavery within any State; or with Slavery in the District of Columbia, without the consent of Maryland and that of the owners of the slaves; or with Slavery in any Territory, where established or recognized by Territorial law or otherwise; or with the slave-trade between the States, except in or through a State or Territory against its laws; the *fourth* negatived any construction of the Constitution, by which any State would be prevented from enforcing the delivery of fugitive slaves through State officers; the *fifth* prohibited the foreign slave-trade; the *sixth* prohibited any amendment of the Constitution to the prejudice of Slavery without the consent of all the States; and the *seventh* required Congress to provide for payment by the United States for all fugitive slaves rescued by violence, and for securing to citizens of each State the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several States.

Pending the discussion on these proposals, which conceded to Slavery new prerogatives and guarantees, Mr. Tuck, of New Hampshire, on behalf of a large body of delegates, reported the following preamble in the form of an *address*, and a series of *resolutions*, as an amendment to the report of the Committee, and as a practical and adequate measure of conciliation and peace:

ADDRESS AND RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. TUCK.

To the People of the United States:

This Convention of Conference, composed in part of commissioners appointed in accordance with the legislative action of sundry States, and in part of commissioners appointed by the Governors of sundry other States, in compliance with an invitation by the General Assembly of Virginia, met in Washington on the 4th of February, 1861.

Although constituting a body unknown to the Constitution and laws, yet, being delegated for the purpose, and having carefully considered the existing dangers and dissensions, and having brought their proceedings to a close, publish this address, and the accompanying resolutions, as the result of their deliberations.

We recognize and deplore the divisions and distractions

which now afflict our country, interrupt its prosperity, disturb its peace, and endanger the Union of the States; but we repel the conclusion, that any alienation or dissensions exist which are irreconcilable, which justify attempt at revolution, or which the patriotism and fraternal sentiments of the people, and the interests and honor of the whole nation, will not overcome.

In a country embracing the central and most important portion of a continent, among a people now numbering over 30,000,000, diversities of opinion inevitably exist; and rivalries, intensified at times by local interests and sectional attachments, must often occur; yet we do not doubt that the theory of our Government is the best which is possible for this nation, that the Union of the States is of vital importance, and that the Constitution, which expresses the combined wisdom of the illustrious founders of the Government, is still the Palladium of our liberties, adequate to every emergency, and justly entitled to the support of every good citizen.

It embraced, in its provisions and spirit, all the defense and protection which any section of the country can rightfully demand or honorably concede.

Adapted with primary reference to the wants of 5,000,000 of people, but with the wisest reference to future expansion and development, it has carried us onward with a rapid increase of numbers, an accumulation of wealth, and a degree of happiness and general prosperity never attained by any nation.

Whatever branch of industry, or whatever staple production, shall become, in the possible changes of the future, the leading interest of the country, thereby creating unforeseen complications or new conflicts of opinion and interest, the Constitution of the United States, properly understood and fairly enforced, is equal to every exigency, a shield and defense to all in every time of need. If, however, by reason of a change in circumstance, or for any cause, a portion of the people believe they ought to have their rights more exactly defined or more fully explained in the Constitution, it is their duty, in accordance with its provisions, to seek a remedy by way of amendment to that instrument; and it is the duty of all the States to concur in such amendments as may be found necessary to insure equal and exact justice to all.

In order, therefore, to announce to the country the sentiments of this Convention, respecting not only the remedy which should be sought for existing discontents, but also to communicate to the public what we believe to be the patriotic sentiment of the country, we adopt the following

RESOLUTIONS:

1. *Resolved*, That this Convention recognize the well under-

stood proposition that the Constitution of the United States gives no power to Congress, or any branch of the Federal Government to interfere in any manner with Slavery in the States; and we are assured by abundant testimony, that neither of the great political organizations existing in the country contemplates a violation of the spirit of the Constitution in this regard, or the procuring of any amendment thereof, by which Congress, or any department of the General Government, shall ever have jurisdiction over Slavery in any of the States.

2. *Resolved*, That the Constitution was ordained and established, as set forth in the preamble, by the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity; and when the people of any State are not in full enjoyment of all the benefits intended to be secured to them by the Constitution or their rights under it are disregarded, their tranquillity disturbed, their prosperity retarded, or their liberty imperilled by the people of any other State, full and adequate redress can and ought to be provided for such grievances.

3. *Resolved*, That this Convention recommend to the Legislatures of the several States of the Union to follow the example of the Legislatures of the States of Kentucky and of Illinois, in applying to Congress to call a Convention for the proposing of amendments to the Constitution of the United States, pursuant to the fifth article thereof.

While this amendment was pending, Mr. Chase of Ohio, in behalf of those whose views it embodied, delivered the following remarks:

SPEECH OF GOV. CHASE OF OHIO IN THE PEACE CONFERENCE.

February 6th, 1861.

Mr. President: I have not thought it best to occupy much of the time of the Convention in discussing the propositions presented for its decision. I have indeed been impressed with an idea, that a decision upon these propositions just now may be premature.

I have already stated to the Conference that the Delagates from Ohio act under resolutions of the General Assembly of

that State, one of which requires them to use their influence in procuring an adjournment of this body to the 4th of April next. It is the wish of that State that opportunity may be given for full consideration of any Constitutional amendment that may be proposed here, and especially to avoid precipitate action under apprehensions of resistance to the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln on the 4th of next month.

I have already submitted resolutions in accordance with the views of the Legislature, and intended, at the proper time, to ask a vote upon the proposed adjournment. On consultation with my collegues, however, I find a majority of them averse to postponement; and, in view of the fact that the resolution of the Legislature is not imperative in its terms, and especially in consideration of the assurances constantly given here by delegates from Slaveholding States that, whatever may be the result of our deliberations, no obstruction or hindrance will be opposed to the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln, I have determined to forbear urging a vote.

Upon the respective merits of the propositions of the Committee, and the proposed amendments, I have not much to say. But what I do say will be said in all seriousness.

I do not approve the confident pledges made here of favorable action by the people of either section, or of any State upon whatever propositions may receive the sanction of this conference. The people of the Free States, so far as my observation goes, do not commit their right of judgment to any body. They generally exercise it themselves, and be assured they will exercise it freely upon any proposition coming from this body. Whatever our action may be here, every proposition to amend the Constitution must come before the people. They will discuss it, and must adopt it before it can become a part of the fundamental law. Dismiss, then, the idea that all that is necessary to secure amendments acceptable to a particular interest or section is to secure for them the sanction of a majority in this hall.

The result of the national canvass which recently terminated in the election of Mr. Lincoln has been spoken of by some as the effect of a sudden impulse, or of some irregular excitement of the popular mind; and it has been somewhat confidently as-

serted that, upon reflection and consideration, the hastily-formed opinions which brought about that election will be changed. It has been said also that subordinate questions of local and temporary character have augmented the Republican vote, and secured a majority which could not have been obtained upon the national questions involved in the respective platforms of the parties which divide the country.

I cannot take this view of the result of the Presidential election. I believe, and the belief amounts to absolute conviction, that the election must be regarded as a triumph of principles cherished in the hearts of the people of the Free States. These principles, it is true, were originally asserted by a small party only. But, after years of discussion, they have, by their own value, their own intrinsic soundness, obtained the deliberate and unalterable sanction of the people's judgment.

Chief among these principles is the Restriction of Slavery within State limits; *not* war upon Slavery within those limits, but fixed opposition to its extension beyond them. Mr. Lincoln was the candidate of the people opposed to the extension of Slavery. We have elected him. After many years of earnest advocacy and of severe trial, we have achieved the triumph of that principle. By a fair and unquestionable majority, we have secured that triumph. Do you think we, who represent this majority, will throw it away? Do you think the people would sustain us if we undertook to throw it away? I must speak to you plainly, gentlemen of the South. It is not in my heart to deceive you. I therefore tell you explicitly that if we of the North and West would consent to throw away all that has been gained in the recent triumph of our principles, the people would not sustain us, and so the consent would avail you nothing And I must tell you further, that under no inducements whatever will we consent to surrender a principle which we believe to be so sound and so important as that of restricting Slavery within State limits.

There are some things, however, which I think the people are willing to do. In all my relations with them, and these relations have been somewhat intimate, I have never discovered any desire or inclination on the part of any considerable number, to interfere with the institution of Slavery within the

States where it exists. I do not believe that any such desire anywhere prevails. All your rights have been respected and enforced by the people of the free States. More than this, even your claims have been enforced, under repulsive circumstances, and, in my judgment, beyond right and beyond Constitutional obligation. When and where have the people of the Free States or their representatives refused you any right? When and where have they refused to confer with you frankly and candidly when you imagined your rights to be in danger? They have been and still are patient and forbearing. They do not believe that you need any new Constitutional guarantees. You have guarantees enough in their voluntary action. But, since you think differently, they send us hither to meet you, to confer with you, to consider the questions which threaten the Union, to discuss them freely and decide them fairly.

Now, gentlemen, what do we ask of you? Do we ask anything unreasonable in the amendment which has been submitted? We simply ask that you say to your people that we of the Free States have no purpose, and never had any purpose, to infringe the rights of the Slave States or of any citizen of the Slave States. And that our devotion to the Government and the Constitution is not inferior to that of any portion of the American people. By uniting with us in the declaration we propose, you tell your people at home that no considerable party, that no considerable number of persons, in the Free States, has any wish or purpose to interfere with Slavery in the States where it exists, or with any of your rights under the Constitution. You can say this with absolute truth, and with entire confidence. In all the action of the delegates who favor this amendment, in all our private consultations, every heart has been animated by a most anxious desire to maintain the Union and preserve the harmony of the Republic. No word has been uttered indicating the slightest wish to avoid any obligation of the Constitution, or to deprive you of any right under it. All concur in desiring to give effect to the Constitution and the laws passed in pursuance of it. The same sentiments animate the people of the Free States. Congress has declared, with the almost unanimous concurrence of the members from the Free States, against national interference with Slavery in the Slave States. The Chicago

Convention most emphatically asserted the same doctrine. It has been reiterated over and over again by the Legislatures of the Free States, and by great and small conventions of their people. Is it then too much to ask you to unite with us in a declaration that all fears of aggression entertained by your people are groundless? Such a declaration will go far to insure peace; why not make it?

You profess to be satisfied with Slavery, as it is and where it is. You think the institution just and beneficial. The very able gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Seddon), who commands the respect of all by the frankness and sincerity of his speech, has said that he believes Slavery to be the condition in which the African is to be educated up to Freedom. He does not believe in perpetual Slavery. He believes the time will come when the slave, through the beneficent influences of the circumstances which surround him, will rise in intelligence, capacity, and character, to the dignity of a freeman, and will be free.

We cannot agree with you, and therefore do not propose to allow Slavery where we are responsible for it, outside of your State limits, and under National jurisdiction. But we do not mean to interfere with it at all within State limits. So far as we are concerned, you can work out your experiment there in peace. We shall rejoice if no evil comes from it to you or yours. (Mr. Chase's time having expired, he was unanimously invited to proceed.)

Aside from the Territorial question—the question of Slavery outside of Slave States—I know of but one serious difficulty. I refer to the question concerning fugitives from service. The clause in the Constitution concerning this class of persons is regarded by almost all men, North and South, as a stipulation for the surrender to their masters of slaves escaping into Free States. The people of the Free States, however, who believe that slaveholding is wrong, cannot and will not aid in the reclamation, and the stipulation becomes, therefore, a dead letter. You complain of bad faith, and the complaint is retorted by denunciations of the cruelty which would drag back to bondage the poor slave who has escaped from it. You, thinking Slavery right, claim the fulfillment of the stipulation; we, thinking Slavery wrong, cannot fulfill the stipulation without conscious-

ness of participation in wrong. Here is a real difficulty, but it seems to me not insuperable. It will not do for us to say to you, in justification of non-performance, "the stipulation is immoral, and therefore we cannot execute it;" for you deny the immorality, and we cannot assume to judge for you. On the other hand, you ought not to exact from us the literal performance of the stipulation when you know that we cannont perform it without conscious culpability. A true solution of the difficulty seems to be attainable by regarding it as a simple case where a contract, from changed circumstances, cannot be fulfilled exactly as made. A court of equity in such a case decrees execution as near as may be. It requires the party who cannot perform to make compensation for non-performance. Why cannot the same principle be applied to the rendition of fugitives from service? We cannot surrender—but we can compensate. Why not then avoid all difficulties on all sides and show respectively good faith and good will by providing and accepting compensation where masters reclaim escaping servants and prove their right of reclamation under the Constitution? Instead of a judgment for rendition, let there be a judgment for compensation, determined by the true value of the services, and let the same judgment assure freedom to the fugitive. The cost to the National Treasury would be as nothing in comparison with the evils of discord and strife. All parties would be gainers.

What I have just said is, indeed, not exactly to the point of the present discussion. But I refer to this matter to show how easily the greatest difficulties may be adjusted if approached in a truly just, generous and patriotic spirit.

I refer to it also in order to show you that, if we do not concede all your wishes, it is because our ideas of justice, duty and honor forbid, and not because we cherish any hostile or aggressive sentiments. We will go as far as we can to meet you—come you also as far as you can to meet us. Join at least in the declaration we propose. Your people have confidence in you. They will believe you. The declaration, made with substantial unanimity by this conference, will tranquilize public sentiment, and give a chance for reason to resume its sway, and patriotic counsels to gain a hearing.

Do you say that, after all, what we propose embodies no substantial guarantees of immunity to Slavery through the preservation of Federal powers? We reply that we think the Constitution as it stands, interpreted honestly and executed faithfully, is sufficient for all practical purposes; and that you will find all desirable security in the legislation or non-legislation of Congress. If you think otherwise, we are ready to join you in recommending a National Convention to propose amendments to the Constitution in the regular and legitimate way. Kentucky, a Slave State, has proposed such a Convention; Illinois, a Free State, has joined in the proposition. Join us, then, in recommending such a Convention, and assure us that you will abide by its decision. We will join you and give a similar assurance.

This, gentlemen, is the proposition we make you to-day. It is embodied in the amendment just submitted. Is it not a fair proposition? It is a plain declaration of facts which cannot reasonably be questioned, and a plain submission of all disputed questions to the only proper tribunal for the settlement of such questions—that of the American people, acting through a National Convention.

The only alternative to this proposition is the proposition that the present Congress be called upon to submit to the States a thirteenth article embodying the amendments recommended by the Committee. In order to the submission of these amendments to the States by Congress, a two-third vote in each House is necessary. That, I venture to say, cannot be obtained. Were it otherwise, who can assure you that the new article will obtain the sanction of three-fourths of the States, without which it is a nullity? As a measure to defeat all adjustment, I can understand this proposition. As a measure of pacification, I do not understand it. There is, in my judgment, no peace in it. Gentlemen here, of patriotism and intelligence, think otherwise. I am sorry I cannot agree with them.

Gentlemen say, if this proposition cannot prevail, every Slave State will secede; or, as some prefer to phrase it, will resort to revolution. I forbear to discuss eventualities. I must say, however, and say plainly, that considerations such as these will not move me from my recognized duty to my country and its

Constitution. And let me say for the people of the Free States, that they are a thoughtful people, and are much in earnest in this business. They do not delegate their right of private judgment. They love their institutions and the Union. They will not surrender the one nor give up the other without great struggles and great sacrifices. Upon the question of the maintenance of an unbroken Union and a whole country, they never were, and it is my firm conviction they never will be, divided. Gentlemen who think they will be, even in the worst contingency, will, I think, be disappointed. If forced to the last extremity, the people will meet the issue as they best may; but be assured they will meet it with no discordant councils.

Gentlemen, Mr. Lincoln will be inaugurated on the 4th of March. He will take an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States—of the whole—of all the United States. That oath will bind him to take care that the laws be faithfully executed throughout the United States. Will Secession absolve him from that oath? Will it diminish, by one jot or tittle, its awful obligation? Will attempted revolution do more than Secession? And if not, and the oath and the obligation remain, and the President does his duty and undertakes to enforce the laws, and Secession or revolution resists, what then? War! Civil war!

Mr. President, let us not rush headlong into that unfathomable gulf. Let us not tempt this unutterable woe. We offer you a plain and honorable mode of adjusting all difficulties. It is a mode which, we believe, will receive the sanction of the people. We pledge ourselves here that we will do all in our power to obtain their sanction for it. Is it too much to ask you, gentlemen of the South, to meet us on this honorable and practicable ground? Will you not, at least, concede this to the country?

On the conclusion of these remarks, the question was taken upon the proposed amendment, and it was rejected by the following vote:

Ayes—Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, New York, New Hampshire, Vermont—9.

Noes—Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Virginia—11.

The Loyal Publication Society has already issued a large number of Slips and Pamphlets which have been widely circulated. Amongst the most important are the following:

No. 1. Future of the North West, by *Robert Dale Owen.*
2. Echo from the Army.
3. Union Mass Meeting, Speeches of *Brady, Van Buren, &c.*
4. Three Voices: the Soldier, Farmer and Poet.
5. Voices from the Army.
6. Northern True Men.
7. Speech of Major-General Butler.
8. Separation; War without End. *Ed. Laboulaye.*
9. The Venom and the Antidote.
10. A few words in behalf of the Loyal Women of the United States, by *One of Themselves.*
11. No Failure for the North. *Atlantic Monthly.*
12. Address to King Cotton. *Eugene Pelletan.*
13. How a Free People conduct a long War. *Stillé.*
14. The Preservation of the Union, a National Economic Necessity.
15. Elements of Discords in Secessia, &c., &c.
16. No Party now, but all for our Country. *Francis Lieber.*
17. The Cause of the War. *Col. Charles Anderson.*
18. Opinions of the early Presidents and of the Fathers of the Republic upon Slavery, and upon Negroes as Men and Soldiers.
19. **Einheit und Freiheit, von Hermann Rafter.**
20. Military Despotism! Suspension of the Habeas Corpus! &c.
21. Letter addressed to the Opera-House Meeting, Cincinnati, by *Col. Charles Anderson.*
22. Emancipation is Peace. *By Robert Dale Owen.*
23. Letter of Peter Cooper on Slave Emancipation.
24. Patriotism. Sermon by the *Rev. Jos. Fransioli*, of St. Peter's (Catholic) Church, Brooklyn.
25. The Conditions of Reconstruction, by *Robert Dale Owen.*
26. Letter to the President, by *Gen. A. J. Hamilton*, of Texas.
27. Nullification and Compromise: a Retrospective View.
28. The Death of Slavery. Letter from Peter Cooper to Gov. Seymour.
29. Slavery Plantations and the Yeomanry. By *Francis Lieber.*
30. Rebel Conditions of Peace.
31. Address of the Loyal Leagues.
32. War Power of the President—Summary Imprisonment—by *J. Heermans.*
33. The Two Ways of Treason.
34. The Monroe Doctrine, by Edward Everett, &c.
35. The Arguments of Secessionists.
36. Prophecy and Fulfilment. Letter of A. H. Stephens—Address of E. W. Gantt.
37. How the South Rejected Compromise, &c.
38. Letters on our National Struggle. By *Brigadier. General Thomas Francis Meagher.*

Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No. 863 Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 38.

LETTERS

ON OUR

NATIONAL STRUGGLE,

BY

BRIG.-GEN. THOS. FRANCIS MEAGHER.

Addressed to the Editors of the Dublin "Irishman" and "Citizen."

To the Editor of the Dublin Citizen:

New York, Sept. 26, 1863.

My Dear Sir,—I have been in debt to you for a long, long time. You have sent me your paper constantly, and have written to me frequently. Up to this you have not had from me one word of acknowledgment and thanks. True it is, I have been on the point of dropping you a line, saying how gladly and gratefully I received these evidences of your remembrance; but ever and always, something or other intervened, and I had to throw aside pen, ink and paper, and with them my good intentions in your regard.

This was invariably the case for the last two years or more; camp life being anything but conducive to the maintenance of friendly relations, so far as they depend on the interchange of envelopes and postage stamps.

Strange to say, however, the *Dublin Citizen* used to make its way to me across the ocean, down to Washington, over the

Potomac, into the heart of Virginia. Many a pleasant hour it brought me, in the midst of the cares, worryings, hardships, and hard knocks of a campaign. It gratifies me truly to find that you had taken your stand against the Disunionists of America, and were true and staunch to the Stars and Stripes, and to all of the past, and all of the future, they so grandly symbolize.

But you, who were here for so long a time, and had studied and familiarized yourself so thoroughly with the political questions and parties of the Republic, know well how to discriminate between the unjustified and treacherous revolt of the South and the revolutions which, in Europe, aim to shake off, not sworn alliances and sacred compacts, but mastership and domination, the grasp of the strong, the assumption of the arrogant, all the violence, wrongs and burthens heaped upon the weaker by the more powerful.

You had seen and learned enough during your stay in this country, to know that it was against the spirit and institutions of Democracy—against the freedom and nobility of labor, and all that was most humane, promising, and progressive in the Republic, that the territorial oligarchy of the South rebelled.

Not independence, but domination, was the inspiration and purpose of the rebellion of the Slave Lords, the kings and princes of the cotton-fields and rice-swamps. To achieve this ascendancy, the disruption of the American Union was essential. Hence the seizure of the Federal custom-houses, forts, barracks, munitions and ships of war, the expulsion of Federal officers, the rejection of the Federal authority, wherever force or fraud could effect the same in those uneasy States, where the slavery of the black man constituted the basis of wealth, of social consequence, and political power.

You remember how galling it was to us, whilst writing and speaking in favor of Democracy, and the liberty and new order of manhood the Republic guaranteed, silently to submit to the requirements of the National compact which compelled even the most ardent friends of human freedom to be in a great measure the accomplices of that thralldom which was the cancerous disease, as it was the glaring disgrace, of this great nation, and a violent contradiction of the principles on which it was established. I cannot forget my friend, Mr. Smith O'Brien, asking

me, more than once during his visit to this country, how it was that I could bring myself to be an apologist of the slavery existing in the South. Neither can I forget that, in reply to this question, I told him I was not in favor of slavery, but was devoted to the Union; and that, as the Union involved the slavery he condemned, I had to accept the latter to befriend and serve the former.

National unity, national greatness, the blending of several interests and races with one great power, require many sacrifices of opinion, and, it often times has happened, the toleration of grievous errors themselves; whilst generous impluses, enlightened views, the broader and loftier ideas and plans of government and society, have to be suppressed or modified.

Society itself—even in the household, the narrowest sphere in which it is presented—is held together, rendered harmonious, useful, happy, and beneficent, by similar compromises, by the like forbearance, by the subjection of individual tastes and ambition to certain general regulations, which preserve and govern it as a unit.

O'Connell declared himself willing to have Catholic disabilities (struck off by the Irish Parliament in 1793) re-imposed, provided that the Irish Parliament were restored, and Ireland set thus again on the footing of an independent nation. The first speech he made was made memorable by this declaration. The patriotism of it was never questioned. It did much for his fame. He detested the bigotry which had placed those disabilities on the statute book. He would have had the Irish Catholic, so far as the law and the government were concerned, the unrestricted and perfect equal of the Irish Protestant.

But the independence, and, with it and through it, the prosperity and eminence of Ireland, as a self-ruled and self-sustained nation, was dearer to him, and the more comprehensive and nobler object of his aspirations and great efforts.

In the same spirit was it that the Irish-born citizens of the United States assented to the slavery existing in the South, submitting, without complaint or remonstrance, to this anomaly in the Republic, to the end that these vast States should consolidate, and be one and indivisible! What their love aud ambition for the country of their adoption prompted, their oath of

citizenship enforced. They had either to accept the Constitution, from which that country derived its national functions and authority, in all its parts, and in its complete integrity—with all its imperfections as well as with all its excellencies—or else stand aloof as aliens, availing themselves, it is true, of the liberal advantages it bounteously offered, but contributing nothing to its political security and growth—the foundation and framework on which, and within which, its marvellous activity and enterprise were set in motion, and its consequence and renown, spreading themselves year by year abroad, were reared.

So long as the South, notwithstanding its very peculiar institution, remained faithful to the National compact—submitting to the majority, when the majority asserted themselves legitimately in elections which varied the magistracy or general policy of the Nation, and yielding its duty and good faith to the central authority—not an Irishman invested with the franchise, or otherwise possessed of any political influence, would have cast a vote or uttered a word to disparage or endanger the rights of property to which the South specially laid claim, and which, indeed, were not so much a concession under the Constitution, as a vital inheritance, without the recognition of which there would have been no Union.

Breaking the compact, however, setting at defiance the legally expressed decision of the majority, as it did in the case of the last Presidential election—forcibly seizing the National property—the first to proceed to hostilities—laying siege to and reducing the National forts—compelling the National Government to call forth the military power of the people—plunging the country into a gulf of blood, and almost overwhelming it with taxation—laying waste the commerce of the loyal States wherever its buccaneering ships discovered it on the high seas —every citizen who looked upon the slavery existing in the South as a flagrant inconsistency and a mischievous error in the political system, if it was not, as some pronounced it to be, a most odious and pernicious violation of the moral code, felt released from his obligation to tolerate what his humanity and conscience had long condemned.

The annihilation of slavery in the South, however, was not the primary, nor, indeed, the remote or ulterior object of the

war which the National Government was driven to wage against traitors and insurrectionists of the South. At first, and for some time, this war was prosecuted with the single purpose of reinstating National authority wherever it had been deposed, of recovering the National property wherever it had been seized, and compelling the observance of that good faith to the trustees and administrators of the National domain and revenues —the condition on which the National protection was afforded, the National resources applied, and the National *prestige* extended to every member, State, or Territory of the Union.

But, as the war went on, new developments occurred; and amongst these, the emancipation of the slaves in the revolted States became a military necessity, which none but the rebels in arms, or the meaner and more malignant rebels in conspiracy with them at the North, were found unwilling to admit. Thus the inexorable logic of war compels the justice which fidelity to the Constitution solemnly withheld, and the rebellion of the South emancipated all true Republicans from their complicity with an ordained system of bondage, which, as I have said before, was not only in conflict with their humanity and conscience, but falsified the spirit, and neutralized the glory of a Republic, which otherwise was unexceptionable and incomparable.

Thus purified from slavery, the National boundaries and property reclaimed, the National authority re-established, the National flag flying proudly from every wall and mast from which it has been dragged down, the Republic of the United States will be reconstructed, and in its reformation will be stronger, worthier, nobler, than ever. All the blood, all the treasures, all the agony it has cost to preserve it from the fate of Mexico, will render it the more valuable and irresistible in the future; and, admonished by the recollection of the perils into which it was plunged by the ambition of those who would have divided it for their own aggrandisement and splendor, the politicians, as well as public men of a higher stamp, will be careful to avoid a recurrence to those exasperating practices from which the Disunionists furnished themselves with the only arguments that seemed to justify their treason. There will be a sounder, manlier and fairer life thenceforth—a life of justice, courage and

dignity, instead of a life of bickering, corruption, scheming and vulgarity as heretofore—visible and dominant in all public places, from the Ward Committee-room to the Halls of Congress.

I need not say to you, it will ever be to me a kindling recollection, that, at the head of my noble little Brigade, I have stood true, on many a fiercely fire-swept field, to the Government of the United States, and all it represents and holds in trust. The basest of the base would we have been, had we stood by and seen, without emotion, without a blush, without striking a blow to save it, that munificent and gracious Government, despoiled, crippled, shorn of half its consequence, of the dutifulness and homage due to it, and made the laughing-stock of the slave-owners and cattle-breeders of Europe generally, and Ireland in particular. Thank God! that disgrace has been averted from our race by the splendid conduct of the thousands of Irish soldiers who have been the life, the heart, the soul of the Federal armies; and who, in upholding with their storng arms the honor and authority of the Government, to which, on ceasing to be exiles and becoming citizens, they swore allegiance, proved themselves worthier of a better and brighter destiny than that which has, for a winter of centuries, shrouded the land of their birth in a dense mist of misery and humiliation—the most woeful and death-like that ever darkened the hopes and memories of of a nation.

With sincere regard and friendship, believe me, my dear Roche, always to remain most faithfully yours,

THOMAS FRANCIS MEAGHER.

To the Editor of the Dublin Irishman:

New York, September 5, 1863.

My Dear Sir,—You will readily acknowledge how difficult it was for me to write to you whilst I was in the field. Being constantly occupied with the duties of my command, I had little or no time left me for anything else. You, who have known me long and intimately, and can make the fullest allow-

ances for what those, who do not know me so well, would ascribe to thoughtlessness and indifference, will generously forgive my silence.

I sincerely assure you this silence was most painful to me, for I was extremely desirous of thanking you, in the name of my noble little Brigade, and all true Irishmen, in and out of the army, for the energetic fidelity, and the strength of the arguments and illustrations, with which you vindicated the Government of the United States in its great effort to put down the insurrection of the slave-holding aristocracy of the South. It was cheering, indeed, to find you standing foremost amongst those few intelligent, grateful, and upright men, who in Ireland recognized the justice and grandeur of the National cause, and the military proceedings it became necessary to resort to in its defense. That the conduct of others, who thought and acted otherwise, was a sourse of the deepest mortification, you will easily comprehend. The sentiments and disposition of the Irish public—so far as speeches and newspapers can be taken to interpret them truthfully—in regard to that cause, and the action of our Government, were not such as the loyal citizens of this Republic had reason to expect.

That the expression of them hurt us essentially, or in any grievous measure, it would, of course, be absurd of me to say. Ireland, most unfortunately, has been so humiliatingly reduced as a political power, that her sympathies and opinion, whether for good or evil, exercise no influence of any sensible force on the policy or fate of other nations. Nevertheless, where an intelligent appreciation of the rights and duties of our Government—a clear conception of the unjustafiable and wanton character of the Southern insurrection—and hearty good wishes for the success of the National arms, in the contest into which they were compelled—were naturally looked for, it was with a feeling of sore and somewhat scornful disappointment that the partisanship of the Irish public with the aristocrats of Carolina and Virginia was regarded here. This unnatural partizanship has done more harm to Ireland than, in the present circumstances of Ireland, it could possibly do to the United States, and the claims and authority the National armies are in the field to assert.

You know there has been, ever since the time that Mr. Rufus King was sent from Washington as Minister to England, a party in this country, inveterately prejudiced against all foreigners, and especially so against the Irish. You know, too, how impotent this party has proved to be in every attempt made by it to exclude the objects of its prejudice and hostility from a due and full participation in the rights, immunities, liberties, and public honors of the Republic. You know that all the offensive declamation it indulged in at different times, all the secret or more flagrant combinations it formed, all the distrust, jealousy, and rancor it excited, signally failed to obtain the sanction of any Administration, or any Congress, or any statesman or politician of positive note, to the legalized disparagement and disqualification of the foreign-born portion of the population in any vital, or even in any trivial particular. The liberal and lofty spirit animating the laws and institutions—the frank and hospitable nature of the people born of the soil—the history of their origin and triumph as a powerful commonwealth—all forbade and repelled the pitiful intolerance which would convert the accidents of birth and lineage into disheartening and crippling disqualifications.

The mischief resulting to Ireland from her attitude in relation to the Government of this country, in its conflict with the slave-masters of the South, will develop itself in the new argument it furnishes the bigots to whom I have referred, and who revive with every incident or event which directly, or by implication, serves as a foundation for their charges of disaffection against those thousands of emigrants who make sail for these shores in search of fairer play for their industry, a friendlier society, and a happier home. The identification of the Irish people at home with the Orangemen and Tories of England in their avowed sympathy and active connivance with the Rebels in aid of whom the shipwrights of Glasgow and Birkenhead launch a buccaneering fleet on the high seas, whilst their saucy representatives in Parliament urge an audacious intervention —this identification, so far as it has been indicated by the editors and orators of Dublin, Cork, and other places, will not be forgotten by the jealous exclusionists of this country when the war is over. Nay, it may be difficult hereafter to rouse some

of the staunch old friends of the Irish people, and kindle anew in them the fire with which they battled for their rights in former times, when they remember how, even in the very season when the loyal States were pouring their grain and gold into Ireland to relieve its starving poor, the public opinion of Ireland, announced through these organs, went forth to condemn the action of the National Government, and approve the infidelity and usurpations of its enemies.

I am ready to acknowledge—for I feel convinced—that, in some instances, this opinion has been at fault, owing to sheer ignorance or misconception of the object aimed at by the Southern politicians and the forces they have organized. The generous heart of Ireland is ever prompt to sympathize with the efforts of a people in arms to strike down an oppressive mastership and establish their independence. Restless for centuries with the hope and passionate desire to see the like great end attained in Ireland, that heart finds some relief for its burning fever in the delight and thorough joyousness which the approach of other nations to liberty inspires. Hence its congratulations when the colonies of Spain broke loose and hurled the viceroys and all the other stipendaries of Madrid headlong from the Andes. Hence its bonfires and hymns of gladness when the noble workmen and chivalrous young students planted once again the Tricolor of the Republic on the palaces as well as on the barricades of Paris, and, with sublime visions and aspirations, dedicated France, for a third time, to the reign of the people and the service of humanity. Hence, to-day, the eagerness with which the splendid heroism of Poland is followed from one field of battle to another, and the offerings which go forth, on the wings of a sister spirit, to sustain the holy war against the Muscovite. Hence, in fine, the sympathy of Ireland in the instances I have excepted with the revolutionists of the South, and the strange indentification with the mischievous and malignant sentiment and activity of England against the Federal Governmet, of several honest men who hate the very name of England, and, if they could compass it by their deaths, would wrench her, root and branch from the seas, and free the world for ever of her.

In such instances, with such men, sympathy with the disloyal

States of the American Union is the error of generous natures inflamed with the love of liberty and an intense hatred of oppression. A wild error, truly, since it confounds the conspiracy and outbreak of a lawless ambition and lust of power, with the struggles for equal laws, fair play, the God-given rights of conscience, national life and position, an unfettered manhood. He who confounds these two enterprises—the one of lawless ambition and lust of power with the one of the down-trodden against the despot, and conscience against the persecutor—would confound a mutiny and massacre on ship-board with the fidelity and bravery that beats off the pirate or swerves her from the breakers. He would plant the statues of Cataline and Cicero on the same pedestal in the Senate, and despatch the faithful and the false in the one fiery chariot to heaven together.

It would be difficult, indeed, for the most eager or reckless partisan of the Southern insurrection to assimilate it with any one of those righteous and heroic uprisings I have referred to, or identify the former with the latter, in any one instance, or in any one essential particular. Not one act of injustice justifies it. Not one. Mr. Stephens, the Vice-President of the Confedercy, in that virtuous and glorious speech of his, in which he besought and warned his native State of Georgia not to follow the example of South Carolina, which had just passed in Convention the ordinance of Secession, unequivocally and emphatically declared that no wrong, threat, actual or probable usurpation of the Federal Government and Congress could be invoked to justify the withdrawal of the Slave States from the Union. The Governor of Florida, at the same time, said the same thing. So did the Governor of Georgia, who presided at the meeting at which Mr. Stephens spoke. The fact is, as you well know, the vast majority of the people, North and South, ever have most scrupulously and sensitively guarded the reserved and special rights of the South. They have done so with the most sterling and stern fidelity, doing violence to their own great instincts, and in defiance of the sarcasms and scurrility their rigid observance of good faith with the South drew down upon them from the hypocrites of Exeter Hall, and the reproaches of the honest npostles of human liberty in the more truthful and chivalrous parts of Europe. In a word, the political power

of the North and West stood as a wall of granite between the South and the New England neophytes and crusaders of Exeter Hall, and that wall was never stronger and loftier than the very day that Mr. Lincoln was elected President. A positive majority, pledged to stand by the South and repel every encroachment on its peculiar rights, was returned to Congress at the same election. No apprehension, therefore, of injustice could be rationally entertained by the South, at that time, even for a moment.

True it is, laws and resolutions, in contradiction of the rights claimed by and guaranteed to the South under the Constitution, had been passed in the legislatures of Wisconsin and Massachusetts, and decisions of the Supreme Courts of two or three of the Northern and Western States were in conflict with the obvious requirements of certain special enactments of Congress—the Fugitive Slave Bill for example. But in all these instances the authority of Congress overtopped the authority of the States, and the resolutions, decisions, and laws in question, offensive and faithless as they seemed to be to the South, had no more effect than so many soap-bubbles blown in its face. In no instance, under no Administration, whether Whig or Democrat, were the claims and rights of the South ever compromised or overborne. You remember the little Yankee brig in which I came to New York in 1852, from Pernambuco? The year before, she had brought back, to his master in Savannah, the runaway slave Simms, despite of all the rampant rhetoric of Wendell Phillips, and the seditious excitement he, and others like him, had kindled on the occasion of the unfortunate slave being arrested in Boston by the officers of the Federal Government. The plain truth of the matter is, fidelity to the South was a more vehement passion with the North than the love of gain, the love of adventure, the love of liberty itself. For the sake of maintaining the National unity, and the Constitution in which it was framed, the North became nothing less than the obsequious vassal of the South, and seemed to hold every interest in the country subordinate to that of the Plantations. Hence, for fully half a century and more, it was the South that held the White House, and controlled, if it did not monopolize,

the Government. Hence, in fine, the irritability of the South when the Democratic party was ousted by the Republicans, and a new order of men proceeded to take possession of the Capital.

This transfer of power was too much for them to bear with equanimity and the cheerful resignation of good citizens. They had been the dominant party, and must remain so—if not in the Union, why then, out of it, and spite of it. What! they, the courtly and sumptuous lords of the rice swamps and cotton-fields, the inheritors of the blood of the Huguenots and Cavaliers, give way for four years to the lanky and marrowless heirs of those beggarly outcasts of Pilgrims! South Carolina cannot submit to that—she must set up for herself. Georgia and Alabama agree with her; and then the rest of them that live, and grow sleek and haughty, on the sweat of the black skin, and propagate their own rare blood for the auction block, the branding-iron, the lash, and all the noisomeness of a brutal bondage. Sift it to the bottom—sift and probe it in every direction—and you will find that the conspiracy and outbreak of the South against the Union is the conspiracy and outbreak of insolent pretension, lawless ambition and lust of power, as I have already said, and nothing more, if anything could be worse.

An anecdote sometimes is worth a volume of history and logic. Here is one that displays broadly, in the clearest light, the purpose and character of the Southern rebellion.

The month of August immediately preceding the election of Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Toombs and Mr. Cobb, of Georgia—both well and widely known, abroad as well as at home, as politicians of considerable influence and ability, and as accomplished gentlemen occupying high social as well as high political position in the South—paid a visit to New York. A day or two after their arrival, they dined with a gentleman you are familiar with, and who wields extraordinary power, whilst occupying a singularly conspicuous position as a public man. I give you his name in a private note; for, although he told me the circumstances I am now relating without any reservation whatever, and without intimating in the least that the information was confidential, I do not feel myself at liberty to introduce his name in this letter, which is

destined to find its way into your columns I presume, in case neither an iceberg nor an iron-clad buccaneer from Birkenhead overhauls it on the ocean.

Well, at the dinner referred to, in reply to the protests of this gentleman against the avowed determination of the South to secede, in the event of Mr. Lincoln being made President, Mr. Toombs declared that the South should never remain a day in the Union under a Republican administration, since the acceptance of such an administration would *republicanize* the slave States.

"Why not wait for some overt act of Mr. Lincoln against the South—something positive and tangible, to justify your assertions that it will be a government of sectionalism and encroachment, and that it will disregard and set at nought the obligations imposed upon it by the Constitution?"

"That," Mr. Toombs replied, "is what we cannot afford to do. It would be fatal to the South, as a political power based upon slavery, to permit the experiment. Should we recognize Mr. Lincoln as our President, and suffer him to exercise authority in the slave States, he would very soon build up in them a Republican party by his dispensation of the Federal patronage. He would have, of course, to appoint, from those who elected him, Collectors of the Port, Custom-house Officers, District Attorneys, United States Marshals, Postmasters and Mail Agents, and every one of these officers would at once become Republicans, if they were not Republicans before, and a multitude of subordinates would swell the list in no time. Thus the political identity of the South would be destroyed. A party, more or less hostile to slavery, would grow and spread itself amongst us, and the South could never again hope to have the undivided sway it had."

In other words, the aristocrats of the South—the Masons, Cobbs, Hunters, Slidells, Prestons, and Breckinridges—would have to relinquish their monopoly of Washington, and take a fair chance, in the contention for public honors and the magistracy of the nation, with their less patrician fellow-citizens of the North and West. Rather than submit to this, they must set up a Republic for themselves, in which they may rest assured of an undisturbed enjoyment of official power, and pro-

long far into the autumn of their days their midsummer delights of statesmanship and diplomacy. And for this—to realize this selfish and insatiable ambition—they draw the sword across the National domain—seize the National forts and ships—plunder the custom houses, sub-treasuries, and arsenals—reject and violate the national flag—tear asunder the Republic with violent hands, and proceed to erect a hostile Government upon a fragment of it, amid the cheers, of course, of all their friends across the water. Think what a catalogue and folio of selfishness, greediness of notoriety and dominion, rapacity, treachery, irreverence, and abandonment of all that was most sacred and imperative in the past, recklessness of all that was most promising and inspiring in the opening vistas of the future, this Southern *coup d'etat* sufficed to publish to the world! No wonder that it has had the sympathies of the imperial *parvenu*, whose eagles leave their unfinished work in Italy, where they were promised a full swoop from the Adriatic to the Alps, to whet their beaks and plume themselves anew, high up amid the sun-blaze, on the torn entrails of poor Mexico. No wonder that it has had the backing of that old Tory monarchy, whose magnificent rival on the seas it promised to cut down to a manageable size, and the example and inspiration of whose liberal government, improved code of public law, system of political action, and ever-accumulating estate, presented so unsafe and overshadowing a contrast to the hereditary burthens, the stingy franchises, the domination of privileged classes, the monopolized lands, the surfeited Church Establishment, and all the other gilt and bloated follies, nuisances, boasts, and falsehoods over which the lion and the unicorn rampantly keep guard.

Thank God! there have been thousands of Irishmen in New York, in Massachusetts, in Ohio, in Pennsylvania, in Illinois, Indiana, Vermont, and Maine, to rescue the Irish name from the disgrace of being involved in the infamous scheme to rend asunder, and reduce to the condition of an unstable and the proportions of an inferior power, that great beneficent nation which has been for eighty years and upwards, the sanctuary and renovation of the improverished and oppressed of Europe. I say nothing against the Irishmen who have fought under Lee

and Beauregard. It is hard for men of generous and warm natures to break away from the associations in which they find themselves at such a crisis as a civil war, and sternly do their duty in spite of their social relations and affections, and the influences which the chosen scene of their labors, their home, their friends, and their success, naturally and powerfully exercise. But without writing one offensive or unkind word in allusion to them—and I have never done so once in all I have written and spoken about the war—I turn with pride and exultation to those of our race who stood true to the Government of the United States, and in the vindication of its honor and prerogatives pledged the fire of their hearts and the vigor of their arms. If it was a noble exploit to plant and consolidate this government, it is, surely, an undertaking deserving of equal, if not greater, praise, applause, and benediction, to defend and preserve it to the last. I shall not prolong this letter to vindicate, on behalf of the Irish soldiers in the Federal armies, a course of action which their impartial intelligence dictated, their gratitude prompted, their love of genuine liberty inspired, their clear sense of justice sanctified, their oaths of citizenship enforce. In the honored graves in which many of them sleep to-day they are not on trial for their loyalty and heroism. Their services and devotion, their willing self-sacrifice and death in the blaze of battle, left them high above the arguments of the living crowd, investing them with a glory which no criticism should be suffered to approach, and from which no criticism, however presumptuous, can detract. Believe me to be, with sincere regard, your faithful and affection friend,

THOMAS FRANCIS MEAGHER.

To P. J. Smyth, Esq.,
Editor of the *Irishman*, Dublin.

The Loyal Publication Society has already issued a large number of Slips and Pamphlets which have been widely circulated. Amongst the most important are the following:

No. 1. Future of the North West, by *Robert Dale Owen.*
2. Echo from the Army.
3. Union Mass Meeting, Speeches of *Brady, Van Buren, &c.*
4. Three Voices: the Soldier, Farmer and Poet.
5. Voices from the Army.
6. Northern True Men.
7. Speech of Major-General Butler.
8. Separation; War without End. *Ed. Laboulaye.*
9. The Venom and the Antidote.
10. A few words in behalf of the Loyal Women of the United States, by *One of Themselves.*
11. No Failure for the North. *Atlantic Monthly.*
12. Address to King Cotton. *Eugene Pelletan.*
13. How a Free People conduct a long War. *Stillé.*
14. The Preservation of the Union, a National Economic Necessity.
15. Elements of Discords in Secessia, &c., &c.
16. No Party now, but all for our Country. *Francis Lieber.*
17. The Cause of the War. *Col. Charles Anderson.*
18. Opinions of the early Presidents and of the Fathers of the Republic upon Slavery, and upon Negroes as Men and Soldiers.
19. Einheit und Freiheit, von Hermann Rafter.
20. Military Despotism! Suspension of the Habeas Corpus! &c.
21. Letter addressed to the Opera-House Meeting, Cincinnati, by *Col. Charles Anderson.*
22. Emancipation is Peace. *By Robert Dale Owen.*
23. Letter of Peter Cooper on Slave Emancipation.
24. Patriotism. Sermon by the *Rev. Jos. Fransioli*, of St. Peter's (Catholic) Church, Brooklyn.
25. The Conditions of Reconstruction, by *Robert Dale Owen.*
26. Letter to the President, by *Gen. A. J. Hamilton*, of Texas.
27. Nullification and Compromise: a Retrospective View.
28. The Death of Slavery. Letter from Peter Cooper to Gov. Seymour.
29. Slavery Plantations and the Yeomanry. By *Francis Lieber.*
30. Rebel Conditions of Peace.
31. Address of the Loyal Leagues.
32. War Power of the President—Summary Imprisonment—by *J. Heermans.*
33. The Two Ways of Treason.
34. The Monroe Doctrine, by Edward Everett, &c.
35. The Arguments of Secessionists.
36. Prophecy and Fulfilment. Letter of A. H. Stephens—Address of E. W. Gantt.
37. How the South Rejected Compromise, &c.
38. Letters on our National Struggle. By *Brigadier. General Thomas Francis Meagher.*

Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No. 863 Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 39.

A REPLY TO THE "BIBLE VIEW OF SLAVERY, BY J. H. HOPKINS, D. D., BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF VERMONT."

BY H. DRISLER.

THE "Bible View of Slavery" is the title of an essay by Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, reissued in a pamphlet of sixteen pages, by an association for the "Diffusion of Political Knowledge," in this city, to influence the recent election in Pennsylvania. Though professing only to bring forward the Biblical arguments in defence of slavery, it yet discusses political subjects, drawing an unfavorable picture of the immorality and crime of our free Northern States, as contrasted with the moral purity and primitive simplicity of the slave-holding Southern States. The value of its political teachings, with its bitter denunciation of the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence, filling four and a half of its sixteen pages, has been already passed upon by the people of Pennsylvania. Its attempt to press Holy Scripture into the cause of a system of tyranny almost unequalled in the history of our race, and founded on violence and robbery—a system which, frowned upon by the almost universal reprobation of the Christian world, sets itself in defiant opposition to and raises its rebellious hand against the duly constituted authorities, has called forth the indignant protest of the noble Bishop of Pennsylvania, in whose diocese it was circulated.

The assertion which the writer undertakes to prove from Holy Scripture is this, as set forth by himself: "The slavery of the negro race, as maintained in the Southern States, appears to me fully authorized in both the Old and New

Testaments, which, as the written word of God, afford the only infallible standard of moral rights and obligations:" "and thus [by the Southern slaves becoming Christianized through slavery] the wisdom and goodness of God are vindicated in the sanction which his Word has given, and the sentence originally passed upon Canaan, as a curse, has been converted into a blessing" (p. 16); and again: "Under the rule of the Scriptures and the Constitution of the United States, the negro belongs to an inferior race, which *the law did not presume to be fitted for freedom at any age*" (p. 12); and finally: "God, in his wisdom and providence, caused the patriarch Noah to predict that he [the negro] should be the servant of servants to the posterity of Japhet" (p. 12). This, then, is the proposition, that the *negro slavery of the Southern States* is justified by Holy Scripture.

In the examination of the writer's arguments, therefore, we have nothing to do directly with Hebrew slavery, or Greek slavery, or Roman slavery, or any other system than that now in force in the slaveholding states of the Union. The writer divides his arguments into two main heads, those from the Old Testament and those from the New Testament Scriptures. The most of these have necessarily nothing to do with the subject under discussion, as they relate exclusively to the special enactments for the regulation of the Hebrew social system. By way of introduction the writer asserts that "Slavery appears to have existed in all the ages of our world, by the universal evidence of history, whether sacred or profane." It may be sufficient to set over against this, the assertion of one certainly not *less* eminent in the church than the author of the pamphlet before us. St. Chrysostom says: "But if you ask whence slavery has its origin, and why it has entered into human life, for I know that many readily ask and are desirous of learning such things, I will tell you; avarice, vulgar display, and insatiable cupidity, begat slavery; since Noah had no slave, Abel had no slave, nor Seth, nor yet those after this;" (Hom. in Epist. ad Ephes. 22.)

The first argument from the Old Testament, and the only one really touching the subject, is from Genesis ix. 25:

"Cursed be Canaan, *a servant of servants* shall he be to his brethren. Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan *shall be his servant.* God shall enlarge Japhet, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant;" which the writer applies to the unfortunate African in this wise: "But the actual fulfilment was reserved for his (Ham's) posterity, after they had lost the knowledge of God and become utterly polluted by the abominations of heathen idolatry. The Almighty, foreseeing this total degradation of the race, ordained them to servitude or slavery under the descendants of Shem and Japhet, doubtless because he judged it *to be their fittest condition.*" Here and in subsequent passages the writer substitutes Ham for Canaan, which is essential to his object; and combines with this the astonishing declaration that we are still living under the Mosaic law. To show that this is no exaggeration or perversion, however surprising it may be, we give his own words. In fact these two points are essential in order to derive any countenance to negro slavery from the Bible: 1st, that the curse passed upon Canaan shall extend to the other children of Ham; and 2dly, that we, conjointly with the children of Israel, should be directed or authorized by God's law to buy bondmen and bondmaids of the heathen nations around us. Otherwise what becomes of the African slave trade, and its supporters? After quoting our Saviour's words: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil" (Matt. v. 17, which very passage ought to have stayed the hand of this Christian Bishop, as he copied it, by recalling to his mind that Saviour's own summary of the law and the prophets, in Matt. xxii. 37–39: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind;" and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself; on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets")—he goes on to say: "The next evidence which proves that *the Mosaic law was not held to be inconsistent with the Gospel* occurs in the statement of the Apostles to St. Paul, made some twenty years, at least, after the establishment of the first Christian church in Jerusalem. 'Thou

seest, brother,' said they, 'how many thousands of Jews there are who believe, *and they are all zealous of the law.*' (Acts, xxi. 20.) How could this have been possible, *if the law was supposed to be abolished by the new dispensation?*"

That the law here referred to was the ceremonial law is quite evident from the rest of the chapter; for in the next verse St. Luke says: "And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs." They therefore prevail upon St. Paul to go through certain ceremonies of the Jewish religion, the conclusion of which leads to a tumult, in which St. Paul's life is in danger, and he is only saved by the interposition of the Roman commander. In the next chapter (xxii. 3), St. Paul says, in his address to the people, that he was "taught according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers, and was zealous toward God, as ye all are this day." Under this Mosaic law, then, one of the most stringent and most frequently repeated commands of God, and the longest in the Decalogue is: "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy," etc., and, in enforcing this command, God said: "Every one that defileth the (Sabbath day) shall surely be put to death; for whosoever doeth *any work* therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people." If the law is not fulfilled or abolished, then this command is in force, for it was not repealed by our Saviour, since he taught on the Sabbath days; yet the whole Christian world, with few exceptions, constantly violate it, observing another day, and thereby incurring the penalty of death. St. Paul says (Ephesians ii. 15) of Christ: "Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments (contained) in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, (so) making peace." Again (Gal. ii. 16), "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law, for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Hooker (Eccles. Law, bk. 3, ch. 10)

says: "The law of ceremonies came from God, Moses had commandment to commit it unto the sacred records of Scripture, where it continueth even unto this very day and hour; in force still as the Jew surmiseth because God himself was the author of it. . . . . But (that which they in the blindness of their obdurate hearts are not able to discern) sith the end for which that law was ordained is now fulfilled, past and gone; how should it but cease any longer to be which hath no longer any cause of being in force as before." God's moral law endures though institutions change, and "thou shalt not covet" will be in force, when and where no "man servant," or "maid servant" exists to be coveted.

But let us turn to the Bible narrative, and see whether it sustains the Bishop's proposition. In the ninth chapter of Genesis the sacred writer says: "God blessed *Noah and his sons*, and said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply . . . . and the fear of you and the dread of you shall be upon every beast, etc. . . . . Into your hand are they delivered," and again, vv. 8, 9, "God spake unto Noah and to his *sons* [no exception is made] with him, saying, Behold I establish my covenant with *you* and with *your seed* after you." Thus from God's holy Word we see that the Almighty blessed *Noah and his sons*, and made a covenant with them and with their seed after them; and that blessing we are justified in believing continues unto this day. In vv. 21–25 of the same chapter Noah's drunkenness and Ham's offence are narrated, and the curse pronounced on Canaan as previously quoted. No revocation of God's blessing previously bestowed is hinted at, no censure is passed upon the other children of Ham; there is not the slightest authority in the Bible for any such unwarrantable inference as the writer draws that all Ham's posterity passed under the curse. In chapter x. 6, we are told that the sons of Ham were Cush and Mizraim and Phut and Canaan; in vv. 15–18, the children of Canaan are enumerated, but we will first follow the other sons of Ham in the Bible narrative, and then trace the posterity of Canaan, and we will thus clearly see that the latter alone were under the curse.

Without entering into any of the ethnological or linguistic speculations in regard to the people of Africa, but taking the

Bible narrative as it is commonly received, that Mizraim is Egypt, and Cush Ethiopia, the land above Egypt, we will find that the Bible has made special provision to secure us against the fallacious reasonings of these Christian advocates of most un-Christian slavery. Sacred history informs us that the Israelites found refuge and shelter in Egypt, that afterward they were reduced to servitude and served the Egyptians many years. In due time God led them forth out of Egypt, and it is to be noted how frequently and how earnestly the Almighty impresses this fact upon his chosen people, "I brought you out of the *land of bondage;*" the very preamble to the ten commandments recites the fact that he had brought them out of the *house of bondage.* In the subsequent history of God's people frequent mention is made of the Egyptians; sometimes they conquered portions of the land of Israel, sometimes they came to aid the Israelites against their enemies; but they never were reduced to subjection and held in bondage by them, and finally what is conclusive in their case that they were not under the curse is the statement in Deut. xxiii. 7, 8, "Thou shalt not *abhor an Egyptian,* because thou wast a stranger in his land; the *children that are begotten of them shall enter into the congregation of the Lord* in their third generation." Is any further proof required that the curse upon Canaan did not extend to Ham's other children? Is it not a fearful thing for mortal man to seek to hurl the thunders of the Almighty, and to override the Gospel dispensation of peace and pardon in behalf of a loathsome and accursed system of robbery and oppression? When Balaam was called upon by Balak to curse Israel he replied, "How shall I curse whom God hath not cursed?" There are Christian ministers, it seems, who have no such scruples.

Again in Isaiah (xix. 21): "And the Lord shall be known unto Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation; yea, and they shall vow a vow unto the Lord and perform it." Isa. xix. 24: "In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt, and with Assyria even a blessing in the midst of the land." In Psalm lxviii. 31, we read, "Princes shall come out of

Egypt," and "Ethiopia shall stretch out her hands unto God." Some of the descendants of Cush were settled in Arabia and Upper Asia, among them Nimrod the mighty hunter, and their descendants were among the conquerors of the Israelites in some of their many revolts against the commands of their God.

Let us now turn to the record of Canaan, and see on the other hand, in the history of his posterity, the positive fulfilment of the curse. In Genesis x. 15–18, the children of Canaan are enumerated, "Sidon and Heth, and the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgasite, and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite, and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite." In Deut. xx. 10–14 and 16, 17, after the Israelites have been directed to slay the male inhabitants of the cities that are far off and not of the Canaanites, they are expressly commanded, "But of the cities of these people which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth, but thou shalt utterly destroy them; namely, the Hittites and the Amorites, *the Canaanites* and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites; as the Lord thy God hath commanded thee," i. e., the people of God are here expressly directed, instead of making slaves of the descendants of Canaan, the very ones enumerated above, not the other descendants of Ham, to exterminate them. But in Judges ii. 21, the Lord says: "I also will not henceforth drive out any from before them of the nations which Joshua left when he died:" in iii. 5, 6, we read: "And the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, Hittites, and Amorites, and Perizzites, and Hivites, and Jebusites, and they took their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters to their sons, and served their gods," in this way now and on many subsequent occasions blending the blood of the races. In 1 Kings ix, 20, 21, Solomon is said to have levied bond-service upon all the children that were left of them in the land, whom the children of Israel were not able to destroy, and their descendants are enumerated finally among those who returned from the captivity. (Nehemiah vii. 57.)

Hence it is manifest that the curse pronounced by Noah on

Canaan was strictly limited to his posterity, and that curse was, therefore, exclusively confined to a *white* or at least *non-negro* race. It was moreover fulfilled in the dealings of the Hebrews with the surrounding nations in their conquest and occupation of the promised land.

In the prophets we see already the foreshadowing of the new dispensation of mercy instead of justice, of the remission of all past offences, of the breaking down of that middle wall of partition which the Apostle speaks of between Jew and Gentile, by which all men were placed on an equality in the eyes of God without respect of persons; as we read in Malachi, who closes the books of the Old Testament, "Have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us?" In Jeremiah (xviii. 8), God says: "If that nation against whom I have pronounced turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them." In those days, too, were men who resisted the degenerate and fanatical spirit of philanthropists, and insisted upon the letter of the law as we learn from these words of Ezekiel (xviii. 19): "Yet say ye, why? doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father?" to which the answer is, "When the son hath done that which is lawful and right, and hath kept all my statutes, and hath done them, he shall surely live. The soul that sinneth it shall die. *The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father;*" and again, in the same chapter, "But if a man be just and do that which is lawful and right, ... and hath not oppressed any, hath spoiled none by violence, hath given his bread to the hungry . . . . hath executed true judgment between man and man, ... he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord."

Finally with the advent of our Saviour came full pardon to all mankind, "for he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also *for the sins of the whole world.*" (1 John ii. 2.) He expiated in his own person on the cross the curse upon Canaan, having in his own veins the blood of that very race, since he was descended in a direct line from Rahab of Jericho (to say nothing of Bathsheba and Ruth), if we are to believe the received account of Christ's genealogy. Was this accidental, that the blood of one of this race should mingle with that of the princely line of

Judah, David, and Christ? Or was it not a part of God's eternal design, that in Christ all nations of the earth should be blessed? With Christ's expiation of the curse, therefore, ceased the slavery of the race of Canaan which was the penalty of the curse. How can any Christian man, how can any Christian minister, dare to question the universality of Christ's atonement? How can any minister of the Episcopal Church read in his place Sunday after Sunday those consoling words of the glorious communion service, "for that Thou of thy tender mercy didst give thy only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) *a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world,*" and then deliberately write and publish to the world, that the slavery of the *negro race in the Southern States* is justified by the curse pronounced by Noah upon Canaan?

The other proofs of slavery being sanctioned by the Almighty have all reference to the Hebrew polity, and refer either to the poor Hebrews, their own children, or to the heathen nations around them, and therefore are utterly irrelevant to the point at issue. Whoever wishes to see Hebrew slavery fully and ably discussed, with its numerous checks upon the power of the master, its almost innumerable provisions for the oppressed, sometimes when a master had daughters but no son giving a daughter in marriage to the servant with the inheritance, its amelioration of a harsher earlier slavery, which was adopted like polygamy and other oriental practices by the Hebrews, themselves an Oriental race, sometimes with, sometimes against the consent of the Almighty, must consult the treatise of Dr. Mielziner, admirably translated in the "Evangelical Review" for January, 1862, by Professor Schmidt of Columbia College. To look for a moment at the writer's other arguments: The next proof he adduces is the case of Abraham, who had 318 bond servants born in his own house; and also the case of Hagar, Sarah's fugitive female slave, whom the angel of the Lord commanded to *return to her mistress and submit herself*. The writer adds: "If the philanthropists of our age had

been willing to take the counsel of that angel for their guide, it would have preserved the peace and welfare of the Union." In a subsequent part of his pamphlet the writer finds a difficulty in maintaining the doctrine of the continuance of the Mosaic dispensation when he seeks to combat the objection, that his argument proves polygamy as well as slavery. He satisfies himself, however, if not his readers, by making slavery an ordinance of the Almighty, but polygamy and the law of divorce which Christ censured, a mere permitted enactment of Moses. In the case of Hagar, the angel, when sending back the slave, tells her at the same time that she is with child by her master, though that master's lawful wife was living, while in Genesis (xxi. 13) God said to Abraham: "And also of the son of the bondwoman will I make a nation, because he is thy seed." (See this applied to the two covenants in Gal. iv. 24.) In like manner the heads of the twelve tribes of Israel were sons of Jacob by two different wives and their two handmaids, all which was allowed and sanctioned by the Almighty before Moses wrote his laws. In 2 Sam. xii. 8, God says to David (through Nathan): "I gave thee thy master's house, and *thy master's wives* into thy bosom," &c.

The next argument is taken from the Tenth Commandment: "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is thy neighbor's." The Bishop thinks there is some prejudice against the idea of *property* in a human being, and is "aware that the wives of our day may take umbrage at the law which places them in the same sentence with the slave, and even with the house and the cattle. But the truth is none the less certain." The writer is certainly consistent in admitting the conclusion from his premises. But what think you, Christian wives, who are with your husbands one flesh, no longer twain, of that Christianity which puts you on a level with the house, and the ox, and the ass? which calls you, our wives and mothers, property, merely to enable the Christian minister to aid the slave-driver and the slave-breeder in keeping his hold on the throat of the man-servant and the maid-servant, lest

those for whom our Saviour died might claim His death as their release ?

Again we may ask, what are the commandments ? They are the same which God spake in the 20th chapter of Exodus, saying, "I am the Lord thy God that brought thee out of the land of Egypt and out of the house of bondage : Thou shalt" &c. If we hold to the literal interpretation, then "thee" and "thou" must refer to the same person, and the commandments must be restricted to those who came out of the land of Egypt. Our Saviour, who was the fulfilment of the law, omitted the "man-servant" and the "maid-servant" in his summary, and substituted the universal brotherhood of man. Will any one quote God's express command to his chosen people, to exterminate the heathen around them, to leave nothing alive that breatheth, as authority for similar acts at the present day ? Can any people in the present age of the world stand in a similar relation to the Almighty with that of the Israelites of old, whose deliverance and settlement in their appointed land were a succession of miracles ? But having shown, as we trust, the fallacy of the argument which deduces *negro* slavery from Noah's curse upon Canaan, it is hardly necessary to dwell upon the other arguments from the Old Testament, for they do not touch the case.

Let us now turn to the second main head, or the arguments in defence of *negro slavery* from the New Testament. The writer enters upon this portion of his subject with the remark : "I grant, of course, that we, as Christians, are bound by the precepts and example of the Saviour and his Apostles ;" while at the same time he quietly ignores the influence of their personal example altogether, since neither our Saviour nor his Apostles ever held slaves. But we will quote the writer's statement on this head of his subject in full : "First, then, we ask what the divine Redeemer said in reference to slavery. And the answer is perfectly undeniable. HE DID NOT ALLUDE TO IT AT ALL. Not one word upon the subject is recorded by any of the four Evangelists who gave his life and doctrines to the world. Yet slavery was in full existence at the time, throughout Judea ; and the Roman empire, according to Gibbon, contained sixty millions of

slaves, on the lowest probable computation! How prosperous and united would our glorious republic be at this hour, if the eloquent and pertinacious declaimers against slavery had been willing to follow their Saviour's example!" That is the argument, and that the deduction.

Next follow the two arguments previously quoted to sustain in full force the Mosaic law, and then those passages are given from the Epistles, which direct servants (*bond servants* or *slaves*) to be obedient to their masters, concluding with St. Paul's letter to Philemon, by the hands of his 'fugitive slave' Onesimus. As in the previous case from the Old Testament, where our argument was directed against the general principle, rather than the individual cases, so here we hope to show that the precepts and example of our Saviour rendered the continued existence of slavery impossible; this being established it will be unnecessary to follow the writer into special details. It may be remarked, however, that the whole argument from the New Testament falls to the ground, as specially bearing upon *negro slavery*. It would only prove the justice of Roman slavery, with its sixty millions of slaves, as the writer quotes from Gibbon. Now of whom did these slaves consist? Not of the descendants of Canaan only; not of those said to be under the curse merely; but of the descendants of Shem and Japhet, as well as of those of Ham. Guizot says above one hundred thousand prisoners were taken in the Jewish war, and Titus sold all the inhabitants of Jerusalem under seventeen years of age. Men of rank and intelligence were reduced to slavery; had it not been for the influence of "the precepts and example of our Saviour and his Apostles" the question which the writer pronounces puerile, "How would you like to be a slave?" might not have been so absurd. The citizens of a conquered city, when once the battering ram had struck the walls, had lost all rights, and were put to death or sold at auction. According to this principle Gen. Grant, instead of paroling his 30,000 prisoners at Vicksburg, should have sold them for thirty millions of dollars.

Now it must be remembered that our Saviour came into the world to preach a personal religion, a reformation of the indi-

vidual heart and life, and therefore had nothing to do with corporations or political ordinances. He belonged to a conquered and subject race, itself under the curse of the Almighty; whatever reformation he desired to make in governments or political institutions must be done by first reforming the individuals controlling them. And this was what actually took place. His silence on the subject of slavery as an institution was no more an approval of it in general, than it was of the oppression and abominations connected with it; the application of torture in an Athenian court, which always accompanied the testimony of a slave; putting to death the slaves of a master who had been murdered; the barbarities of the amphitheatre; crucifixion for the most trifling misconduct (such as speaking disrespectfully, *Blair's Roman Slavery*, p. 111), and the oriental practice introduced into Greece and Rome of making eunuchs, to whose condition our Saviour incidently refers without censuring it. Did he therefore approve of this practice, and would it be justifiable by Biblical arguments?

But let us look at the result that soon flowed from the lessons of humility, love, and human brotherhood, which form the teachings of the meek and lowly Jesus. "Who is my neighbor?" Not the favored Jew, not the self-sufficient Levite, but the despised and hated Samaritan. "A new commandment give I you, that ye love one another." "And whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servant (*doulos*)." Christ came on one occasion into the synagogue on the Sabbath day, and read from Esaias: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; . . . . to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised" (St. Luke, iv. 18); and he began to say to them, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears" (21). Bishop Hopkins tells us, quoting Gibbon's authority, that in our Saviour's time the Roman empire contained sixty millions of slaves. What became of them? In the course of centuries all those provinces of this same Roman empire, which adopted Christianity, abolished slavery. Slavery only continued in those provinces of the old empire, which were overrun and subdued by Oriental and non-Christian races.

And now we see this fact staring us full in the face, that the Christian countries of Europe are the non-slaveholding countries, while slaves are found under the Turk and the infidel.

Whence comes this result, if not from the silent but irresistible influence of "*the precepts and example of our Saviour and his apostles*," which this writer admits we are bound by? Will he tell us that Christianity had nothing to do with it? Hear what he says on this head (p. 4): "It is said by some that the great principles of the Gospel, love to God and love to man, necessarily involved the condemnation of slavery. Yet how should it have any such result, when we remember that this was no new principle, but on the contrary, was laid down by the Deity to his own chosen people, and was quoted from the Old Testament by the Saviour himself? And why should slavery be thought inconsistent with it? In the relation of master and slave, we are assured by our Southern brethren that there is incomparably more mutual love than can ever be found between the employer and the hireling." Is not this the very spirit which God himself rebukes by the mouth of his prophet Ezekiel: "Yet ye say, The way of the Lord is not equal," and "yet ye say, Doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father?" Will Christian men, will Christian ministers, to support a tottering and abominable system of wrong and oppression, pluck from the crown of our holy religion its brightest jewel? Will they join with the infidel and skeptic in ascribing this amelioration in the condition of mankind to a vague civilization, and aid in proclaiming "Christianity a failure"? Even the skeptic Gibbon did not deny this praise to Christianity. But the author says (p. 13): "The Anglo-Saxon race is king, why should not the African race be subject, and subject in that way for which it is best adapted, and in which it may be more safe, more useful, more happy, than in any other which has yet been opened to it, in the annals of the world?" This is strange doctrine—that might makes right—for a Christian minister to promulgate. On what ground, then, does he attack (p. 13) the much-abused King of Dahomey? Is not his the more powerful intellect, and

should not the surrounding tribes be subject? Has the writer any other reason to give for interfering in the local institutions of this king, who is an independent monarch, obeying his own laws—which are his own will—than that same *higher law of conscience*, for obeying which, in reference to the injustice of negro slavery at the South, he assails so violently the philanthropists of our age?

But to return to the point from which we digressed: the religion of Christ, then, we assert, practically put an end to slavery. What distinction of master and slave could long exist in a community where the disciples of the same Lord had all things common? under a religion which taught men to be lowly in their own eyes; which taught that "God had chosen the base things of the world and things which are despised, yea, and things which are not, to bring to naught the things that are; that no flesh should glory in his presence" (1 Cor. i. 27, 28). Having thus shown that the Gospel influence, by acting upon the hearts and consciences of individuals, gradually but surely worked the release of the slave and the extinction of slavery, it will hardly be deemed necessary to dwell upon those exhortations and consolations addressed by the apostles to the faithful servants of Christ, who were also servants after the flesh. All these exhortations show the sympathy of the apostles (St. Paul particularly) with the condition of their unfortunate brethren; where their case is hopeless with an earthly master, they exhort them not to bring reproach upon their Christian profession; advising them to bear for a time their earthly misfortune, since God, for Christ's sake, will in good season give them eternal freedom. St. Paul was a Roman citizen; he was also a Jew, who had abandoned and decried the traditions of his fathers; he was bitterly hated and eagerly watched by the unbelieving Jews, who sought every opportunity of entrapping him. His mission was in no respect political; he was an ambassador of Christ: his duty was to enforce that personal purity of life, and reformation of the heart, which he knew would work all other changes in due time. But in his writings, as everywhere in the New Testament, slavery is the hard lot, to be borne—the burden and the yoke; freedom—the blessing

and reward of endurance. How constantly is this contrast introduced—freedom, liberty—that liberty with which Christ has made us free on the one hand ; and the bondage of sin—servants to uncleanness and to iniquity on the other ? "Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the servants of men." (1 Cor. vii. 23.) Such language, even on spiritual subjects, could not be addressed to men, and men of intelligence, as many of those slaves were, without exciting hopes and wishes for their bodily emancipation. But this the apostles could not procure for them, except by appeal to the consciences of their masters. There was no supreme government which acknowledged the obligations of Christianity. It was therefore necessary to teach slaves the same lessons of submission for the time, which the apostles themselves were bound to observe. How often were they seized upon without process of law, dragged outside the walls, and scourged or stoned ? Though they submitted patiently to such treatment, and gloried in it, we certainly cannot quote their encouragements to each other under the injustice as removing its illegality or sinfulness.

The passages, therefore, which are quoted from St. Paul and the other apostles, as justifying slavery by advising submission to masters, have no force except as addressed to slaves under a heathen master, or where Christianity is an intrusive and foreign element in an unfriendly and heathen state. In the case of Onesimus, whom it is said St. Paul sent back to his "master" as a "slave," how marked the difference between his return and that of Anthony Burns, or any other fugitive slave from the *Christian* South. Read the letter of St. Paul throughout, and then say if it be possible that the two persons there mentioned could have stood afterwards, even allowing they did before, in the relation of master and slave. With what sweet and tender solicitude does the Apostle speak of this "runaway slave ;" what fatherly affection breaks out in every sentence ; with what earnestness, nay, almost authority, does he ask his kindly reception. His language is, "Receive him, that is, mine own bowels ; not now as a servant, but above a servant, a brother beloved, specially to me, but how much more unto thee, both in the flesh and

in the Lord? If thou count me therefore a partner, *receive him as myself.* . . . . Having confidence in thy obedience, I wrote unto thee, knowing that thou wilt also *do more than I say.*" Now, notwithstanding the positiveness with which Onesimus is asserted to be a "runaway slave," there is no proof in the whole epistle that Onesimus was a *slave* at all; the inference that he was a slave rests on the 16th verse—"Not now as a servant," &c. (*doulos*, but *doulos** is not in Greek necessarily *a slave*). There is not a particle of evidence that St. Paul forced or even urged the return of Onesimus. That he returned *as a slave* is inconsistent with the whole tone of the epistle, with the endearing epithets employed, and especially with the last clause quoted above. The circumstance related in the epistle to the Colossians (ch. iv. 7-9) also opposes that view, where Onesimus is joint bearer with Tychicus of St. Paul's message to the Colossians; the same affectionate epithet is applied to him as to Tychicus; and St. Paul says to the Colossians, (Onesimus) "is *one of you*;" i. e., of the Church or of the people of Colossæ, and "they [Tychicus and Onesimus] shall make known unto you all things which are done here." The man who bore that message was surely no *chattel.* Besides, if St. Paul were "zealous of the law," would he venture to send back a "fugitive slave," which the Jewish law so strictly forbade?

St. Paul, moreover, in another remarkable passage, while following the example of his Divine Master, whose kingdom was not of this world, in setting forth the much higher and nobler freedom of the soul, that freedom which even the slave after the flesh may possess and derive happiness from, shows his appreciation of civil freedom by advising, which he may do without risk of interfering with the civil power, "But if thou mayest be free, use it (freedom) rather." (1 Cor. vii. 21.)

The precepts and example of our Saviour and his apostles then brought about that change of feeling which over-

---

* *Doulos* includes also the Roman *libertus* or *freedman*, Chrysipp. ap. Ath. vi. 93. Onesimus was probably steward, or in some responsible position in Philemon's household, thus having the opportunity of appropriating money, which St. Paul promises to repay.

threw the whole system of slavery, the way for which had been prepared by the Jewish economy, with its protection to fugitive slaves, ordained by God himself, and its denunciations against man-stealing. Christian Europe became free—the curse upon Canaan had been expiated—the Jews, as a nation, had ceased to hold slaves—Christian nations had ceased to hold slaves. Now, let the justifier of *negro slavery* point to the revelation of God's will which directed the re-establishment of slavery. No, God did not authorize it. History can here point to the source and the cause. Whence, then, came slavery again into *Christian* society? It arose, as St. Chrysostom says of the first rise of slavery, from avarice and inordinate cupidity. When thousands of adventurers, on the discovery of this new world, in their eager pursuit of wealth, tore away by violence and robbery the unfortunate sons of Africa, to toil for them in the mines and on the plantations of the West Indies and Central America, then was established that horrible iniquity, the African slave trade, and that barter in human flesh which Christianity had entirely removed. The learned Dominican Soto (1542), confessor to Charles V., in opposing this inhuman traffic soon after its establishment, says: "It is affirmed that the unhappy Ethiopians are, by fraud or force, carried away and sold as slaves. If this is true, neither those who have taken them, nor those who purchased them, nor those who hold them in bondage, can ever have a quiet conscience till they emancipate them, even if no compensation should be obtained."—(*Mackintosh's Ethic. Phil.*, p. 79.)

The justification of negro slavery at the South justifies the slave trade; nay, the advocates of the doctrine of this pamphlet are bound to sustain and defend the slave trade. The author tells us: "I believe that the number of negroes Christianized and civilized at the South, through the system of slavery, exceeds the product of (English and American) missionary labors in a proportion of thousands to one." Let us place in contrast with this system, that which was sanctioned by the "precepts and example of the apostles." St. Luke, in the Acts (viii. 26), relates how St. Philip received a special commission to go towards the South to meet an Ethiopian, and

unfold to him the interpretation of the Scriptures which he was reading. The eunuch was enlightened, converted, and baptized, and returned to his home to carry the knowledge of the Gospel of Christ to his fellow-descendants of Ham ; and perhaps then the first seeds were sown of the Church in Abyssinia which exists to this day. The apostles did not find it necessary to establish a slave trade with Africa, or to bring the body of the wretched Africans under the slave lash in order to convert their souls.

May we not justly fear that we are now, as a nation, suffering the penalty of our complicity in this great wickedness and sin ? God has said : "And he that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death" (Exod. xxi. 16) ; and Jeremiah (xxii. 13) writes: "Woe unto him . . . . . that useth his neighbor's service without wages." God does visit the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate him, i. e. of those who do not abandon the sins of their fathers ; and the children of this generation share in the iniquities of their fathers by adding to the grievances of those whom their fathers wronged. We are told that Virginia and other Southern states commenced a movement to liberate their slaves, but that it was abandoned in consequence of the interference of Northern fanatics. May we not read in this refusal to grant liberty to the oppressed the real cause of the desolation which has spread over the state which was foremost in that iniquity ? The prophet Jeremiah presents us with a similar case, which drew on it the threatened vengeance of Heaven : "And ye were now turned, and had done right in my sight, in proclaiming liberty every man to his neighbor : and ye had made a covenant before me in the house which is called by my name ; but ye turned and polluted my name, and caused every man his servant, and every man his handmaid, whom he had set at liberty at their pleasure, to return, and brought them into subjection, to be unto you for servants and for handmaids. Therefore thus saith the Lord, Ye have not hearkened unto me, in proclaiming liberty every one to his brother, and every man to his neighbor : Behold, I proclaim a liberty for you, saith the Lord,

to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine; and I will make you to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth."

COLUMBIA COLLEGE, *Nov. 12th*, 1863.

NOTE.—The Rev. Dr. Howe, of Philadelphia, states in the Philadelphia Inquirer of Nov. 6, which statement the writer of this article has not seen contradicted, that "a considerable portion (of the original letter of Bishop Hopkins in 1861) was devoted to an argument 'that the Southern states have a right to secede,'" and further, "that this letter was circulated in the slave states, was read, and, as is alleged by the Southern people, did its part in 'firing the Southern heart,' and intensifying its determination to sacrifice the Union, in order to maintain and perpetuate slavery." He adds also, on the authority of a clergyman of Philadelphia, formerly of Virginia, that "Bishop Meade said, at the outbreak of this rebellion, that he had always been opposed to secession, until a letter of Bishop Hopkins convinced him that the Southern states have a right to secede." Numerous inquiries have been made among the dealers in pamphlets and private collectors for this (original) letter, but without success.

After the above was in type, a copy of the original letter (of 1861) was sent to the writer by a friend. The following extracts will show that the charge of justifying secession is only too true.

After charging upon the North every kind of hostility (individual, legislative and congressional) to slavery, the author goes on to say (p. 11 of edition of 1861): "Convinced, as well as they might be, that they could not long resist this advancing deluge of hostility, and knowing that its probable results would be a general insurrection of their slaves, a war of extermination to preserve their own lives, and the final ruin of their prospects if they remained subject to it a few years longer, many of the slave states have resolved to secede from the Union, in despair of obtaining any effectual remedy or guarantee from their uncompromising adversaries. They have desired to secede peaceably, if permitted. If not, they stand prepared to defend what they believe to be the sacred right of self-preservation. . . . . In my humble judgment, they have a right to secede, although I grant that the point, being entirely new, is not without considerable difficulty. I fear that the ingenious arguers against secession have hardly given sufficient attention to this fact, and have therefore very naturally fallen into the mistake of applying the principles of ordinary government to a Constitution which stands alone in the history of the world. . . . . But, on the other hand, the *Constitution does not deny the right*, nor *forbid the act, of secession.* The subject is not expressly adverted to at all. The power of the free States which have thus carried on their assaults upon Slavery, has at length obtained the mastery in the administration of the government, and therefore the Southern States have resorted to their *reserved rights* by seceding, as the only peaceable remedy remaining, since warnings, expostulations, and arguments, have been employed for many years, and all in vain. This act of peaceable secession they utterly deny to be treasonable, because the Constitution, in Article III., § 3, lays down the rule that 'Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.'"

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 40.

THE CONSCRIPTION ACT:

A SERIES OF ARTICLES COMMUNICATED TO THE *JOURNAL OF COMMERCE.*

BY

GEORGE B. BUTLER, Esq.,

Of New York.

No. 1.

For the *Journal of Commerce.* (Published and Replied to Editorially Nov. 18th.)

THE CONSCRIPTION ACT.

Messrs. Editors,—You published on Friday the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania declaring this act unconstitutional, on the grouud, that although the Constitution of the United States authorizes Congress "to raise and support armies," yet, that the same authority has provided for quelling a rebellion by authorizing Congress to call forth the militia of the several States for the purpose; that the expression of this mode amounts—until, the Court adds, the latter is tried *—to the exclusion of any other, and hence, that the general power which follows the enumerated powers, authorizing Congress "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers," does not permit any choice, by Congress, of the means for putting down a rebellion, as one mode, and only one had been provided.

* NOTE.—Chief Justice Lawrie's opinion.

It has been fashionable in sustaining the extreme of the doctrine of State rights, to present this theory of the meaning of the Constitution, and during the sunshine of peace many have acquiesced in it, who, during the storms of war, would have been alarmed at its effects. It now appears to be a most astounding doctrine. It belongs to that class of opinions or measures, which in all the emergencies of the country have been arrayed against the national Government as a solid and substantial structure, and designed to make each State important and sovereign; prominent among which is the attempt to substitute a State for a National currency. If the General Government is forced to rely on the several States for both the sinews of war, and the forces with which a rebellion of States must be quelled, it is placed in a hopeless condition of inferiority, and I say, with Mr. McCulloch, that the expenditure of blood and treasure now being made, if made to sustain such a rope of sand, is not justified by the object; but the present Administration, true to the conceptions of the framers of the Government, and to its necessities, confronted as it is with an emergency involving life or death, have maintained that supplying paper money and raising an army, are necessary and proper means for quelling this rebellion;* and so far as concerns the question, whether an army may be raised for the purpose, independently of the State militia, I think that the strongest argument in favor of its constitutionality, arises from presenting the precise language of the Constitution on that subject in the order in which the authority appears.

The following is the language and the order of the respective powers on the subject, part of section 8 of article 1, commencing: "The Congress shall have power * *

"10. To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water.

"11. To raise and support armies; but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years.

"12. To provide and maintain a navy; and

* Note.—The question of the constitutionality and expediency of Legal Tender issues, was extensively discussed between the writer and the *Journal of Commerce* in their columns, in advance of the adoption of the measure by Congress.

"13. To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces."

The remaining powers shall presently be given. Those quoted leave no doubt that they cover the right to raise and support armies for all or any public purpose, and hence it may be insisted that the right in question exists in full force unless qualified or restricted by subsequent clauses. The language is clear: "To *raise* and support armies," and "to make *rules* for the *government* and regulation of the *land* and naval forces." The enumeration then proceeds:

"14. To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions."

Now, it is contended by the Court that this in fact amounts to a restriction on a power otherwise ample to *raise* armies to suppress a rebellion. In answer to this it will be observed that the language of restriction is not used; neither is the language of compulsion used. The words are, Congress shall have power to provide for calling forth the militia, &c., and why the enumeration of causes for which the militia may be called forth? The militia belongs to the several States, and the presumption might have been against its being forced into the service of the United States, except the occasions on which it might be thus called, were specified. The enumeration of the several national causes for which the militia may be called out, was resorted to, doubtless, for clearness, and yet what is in the form of a substantial addition to authority, is claimed to amount to an important restriction on a precedent power. The Supreme Court of the United States will doubtless uphold the doctrine which enables the government to maintain itself.

This portion of the opinion does not stand upon the ground that conscription, as it is called, was historically unknown,* as some have claimed, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and hence could not have been intended as one of the means which Congress might adopt, but wholly upon the technicality that *a means* having been provided under subdivision 14 for quelling a rebellion, no other can be used. This technicality would make the States invulnerable when they chose to start a

* The historical facts are fully presented in the second article.

rebellion and strip the government of the means to preserve its existence. To support it, requires that all the rules of construction shall be reversed, and that a power conferred in the usual language of a power shall be converted into a restriction when the language of restriction is not employed. The convention might have used terms of restriction. Why was it not done? The answer is obvious. The 14th subdivision was intended as an additional power. The restrictive clauses appear elsewhere, and are complete on the several subjects to which they relate, this not being one.

I contend, therefore, that the power to *raise* armies for quelling a rebellion independently of the militia is complete, and that the mode of *raising* not being specified, any mode known at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, or which shall appear to be efficient in the progress of war, may be employed, such mode being effectual to the end.

The ground that inasmuch as conscription had not been resorted to, as some assert, prior to the French revolution, that mode could not have been within the intention of the framers of the government, and hence is unconstitutional, is wholly untenable, even if such were the case. As well might it be contended that because steamboats were not known till 1814, or Railroads till 1824, or the Swamp Angel until 1863, it is unconstitutional to employ them in war. Did the framers of the Constitution in constructing a government that was to stand for all time, intend that it should not, in considering what were appropriate means to carry the granted powers into effect, avail itself of every improvement that may arise? Is the Sub-Treasury unconstitutional because it was not known in 1787? May not an appropriation be made by Congress for an electric telegraph, for a balloon to watch opposing armies, for a photograph of an enemy's camps, as means of conducting war?

Conscription is a compulsory enrollment of men for the military or maritime service, and may be resorted to instead of the voluntary system, by the General Government, inasmuch as the power "to *raise*" armies conferred on Congress is wholly unlimited, and inasmuch as it is a fundamental feature of every government that it is entitled to the services of its citizens, and if not rendered by choice, their performance may be compelled.

G. B. B.

No. 2.

From the *Journal of Commerce.* (Published and Replied to November 21st.)

THE CONSCRIPTION ACT.

Messrs. Editors,—No more important questions are now up for discussion than the one raised by the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, that only the militia of the States, and not the regular army, may be employed by the general government to put down the rebellion; and the further point raised by your able leader of Tuesday, that, supposing that the army of the Union may be used for this purpose, in raising it, the general government cannot resort to the policy of conscription. In reply to the article on the latter point you did me the honor to publish, you state that it proves too much if it proves that conscription may be resorted to, inasmuch as the same line of argument would sustain impressment, which you justly stigmatize as despotic, and yet you claim that the several States may exercise the power of conscription, which places your position in the same dilemma, if dilemma it be, with mine. I ask your question, may the States resort to the Turkish or Russian mode of surrounding a village and gobbling up the entire active population because they are armed with the right of conscription? Are our States to be pronounced despotic for possessing the right of forced levies?* I think it will be easy to relieve both from the dilemma in which you suppose my argument to be involved. The argument against conscription amounts to this, that no process of compulsory drafting can be resorted to by the general government

* Note.—The power of the States over the subject, showing that it is wholly subsidiary, is discussed in third article.

under the express power "to raise and support armies," but to use your expression, they must be obtained "by contract with the soldiers." If this is so, it is to be noticed as singular, that the framers of the Constitution, who well knew the meaning of words, should not have used the very language that you employ, instead of using a word which imports much more. The authority is to *raise* armies, a word that in no sense contemplates merely a negotiation for the purpose. Why should the verb to raise, which, in the connection used, looks to action of an efficient character, and implies the creation of a suitable and complete structure by the whole vigor of the public power, be dwarfed into a mere authority to bargain for the services of men who are to compose an army? It is a well known principle of construction that every power necessarily includes the full means for carrying it into effect, and hence it is impossible to suppose that the skillful framers of the Constitution could, on a subject which involved the very existence of the great edifice of civil power they were raising, have used any words carelessly or which imported less than their ordinary meaning. I think therefore I shall be able to show conclusively—

1. That Conscription (i. e., compulsory enrollment and service) was perfectly well known historically at the time of the adoption of the Constitution.

2. That all modern nations, excepting perhaps England, resort to it or to the principle of it, for raising that portion of the public force on which they chiefly rely: and

3. That as a measure of war it is not only expressly granted without restriction in our Constitution, but is also a necessary and proper power.

The definition of an army in that highly credited work the Encyclopedia Britannica throws some light upon the question. It is defined to be "a certain portion of the community selected, raised or assembled for the defence of the State by means of conscription, voluntary enrollment, tenure of military service or otherwise." Here is a complete grouping of the various modes of raising an army, practiced by ancient and modern nations, and it is not reasonable to suppose that the framers of the Constitution were ignorant of the conscription long practiced in Rome which embraced the compulsory service of every able-

bodied citizen between 17 and 46 to 50. The consummate generalship on the part of her commanders and the heroic valor of the Roman soldiery in the days of her conquests, were attributed to their military organization as well as to their perfect discipline. "In raising troops to constitute the legions (I give nearly the words of the writer from whom I quote) the method adopted by the Romans was that which they constituted elective, because the magistrate chose from the different tribes the citizens whom they considered best fitted for the military service. The Consul or the Prætor assembled in the Campus Martius, or in the Capitol, all the citizens who were bound to concur in the formation of the legions raised every year conformably to a decree of the Senate, and this obligation included all Romans within the ages above specified, who had not served 20 campaigns as foot soldiers or 10 as horsemen or knights; with the exception however of the lowest class, which was exempted from military service on account of poverty. The number of legions commonly raised was four, and the first step consisted in the appointment either by the people or the Consuls of six tribunes to each legion, the conscripts (says the writer) being classed according to their tribes."

The word conscript may not then have been applied to the soldiers. In Roman antiquity it was applied to the Senators of Rome who were called conscript fathers "on account of their names being entered in one register called the censor's roll." This fact of enrollment in France, was doubtless the sole reason for employing the word conscription as it was employed by Gen. Jourdan in 1798, in the project of the law which he presented and which France adopted. But the essence of the enactments of the Senate of Rome and of the council of 500 in France was one and the same. Both processes were compulsory as opposed to the voluntary, and it is upon this that the argument hinges. The Carthagenian army was composed of levies drawn from Africa, Spain, Gaul, &c., and even under the feudal system the compulsory process was employed, each lord being *bound* to have in constant readiness to take the field a certain number of men, clothed, armed and equipped, at his own expense. These historical facts, and others of more modern date, doubtless induced Mr. Calhoun, in his speech delivered

in January, 1816 (vol. II. of his works, p. 146), to give his sanction to the policy of conscription. He says:

"Although militia, freshly drawn from their homes, may, in a moment of enthusiasm, do great service,—as at New Orleans—yet, in general, they are not calculated for service in the field until time is allowed them to acquire habits of discipline and subordination. *On land your defence ought to depend on a* REGULAR DRAFT *from the body of the people.* You will thus, in time of war, dispense with the business of recruiting—a mode of defending the country every way uncongenial with our republican institutions. Uncertain, slow in its operation, and expensive, it draws from society only its worst materials; introducing into our army, of necessity, all the severities which are exercised in that of the most despotic governments. Thus composed, our army, in a great degree, lacks that enthusiasm with which citizen soldiers, conscious of liberty and fighting in defence of their country, have ever been animated. All the free nations of antiquity intrusted the defence of their country, not to the dregs of society, but to the body of its citizens; and hence that heroism which nations in modern times may admire but cannot equal. I know that I utter truths unpleasant to those who wish to enjoy liberty without making the efforts necessary to secure it. Her favor is never won by the cowardly, the vicious, or indolent."

Mr. Calhoun understood the Constitution well. He was then fresh from a large experience in war, many of the measures of which were his, and it is not a little singular that the precise line of argument then adopted by him, should have been used in the important work which I have freely used—the edition of 1842—and from which I again quote to show such coincidence, and in order also to present some statistical facts which bear upon the question.

"The French army is at present recruited partly by voluntary enrollment for a term of years and partly by requisitions; in other words, on nearly the same principle which obtained before the revolution of 1790. The system of requisition is, of course, subsidiary, or supplementary of, voluntary enlistment; but, in the event of another war, it would unquestionably become the principal, if not the only, resource of the army. And this applies to other nations as well as France. Modern manners, customs, habits and pursuits, are primarily adverse to the military service; and this opposition can only be overcome by conscription of one kind or other. Napoleon laid it down as a

principle, '*que la conscription est le mode de recrutement le plus juste, le plus doux, le plus avantageaux au peuple.*" But without being prepared to go this length, it may be admitted that it is equal in its operation: that its results are certain, and that the supplies it furnishes are of the best quality; whilst voluntary enlistment is at best a precarious resource, and sends to the ranks little less than the scum and dregs of the people. At the same time, the French army, as at present constituted, bears a much smaller proportion to the entire population of the country, and is, consequently, less burdensome, than that of any other nation in Europe,—England alone excepted. Russia, for example, requires one man in 97 for her peace establishment, and one in 57 for war. Austria takes one in 60 during peace, and one in 40 during war; Prussia, maintaining a war establishment in peace, withdraws one man in 22 for the service of her army; whilst France requires only one man in 137 for peace, and one in 80 for war. The peace establishment of Great Britain presses even more lightly upon the general mass of the population; but, in the event of a war, the proportion would, in all probability, become as unfavorable for the people as that of the French conscription under Napoleon, namely, one in 33 or 34."

This extract from the Encyclopedia Britannica, showing that modern nations avail themselves of the draft, makes it unnecessary to say much with respect to England; but it must be borne in mind that her insular position makes a navy her chief power in war, and that it is to her policy with respect to it in important junctures, that we look for precedents, if precedent from that quarter is to guide. You state, Messrs. Editors, that the power to *raise* armies was perfectly understood in England as meaning merely the power to *contract* for military service; that the spirit and tone of our Constitution were caught in a great degree from her history and example, and that it is to be interpreted in this respect somewhat or altogether by the significance which she attached to the language. Perhaps I am not precise in stating your position, but your views will be sufficiently remembered. Whilst I do not admit your rule of construction, drawn merely from the historical examples of a single power, when war is the subject, in which ancient nations remain unexcelled, presenting examples which all modern nations must respect, I yet undertake to show that the policy of England in raising the force on which she relies for defence, was mainly that of compulsion, before and after the adoption of our Constitution, and that you

have overlooked the fact that the right to do so has been held in a case arising upon *habeas corpus*. The first case that arose on this writ is reported in Cowp., p. 517, The King *vs.* Jubbs, in which Lord Mansfield says: "The power of pressing is founded on immemorial usage allowed for ages. If it be so founded and allowed for ages, it can have no ground to stand upon, nor can it be vindicated or justified by any reason but the safety of the State, and the practice is deduced from that trite maxim of the constitutional law of England, that private mischief had better be submitted to than public detriment and inconvenience should ensue." Jubbs was then remanded to the ship from which he had been brought. Lord Kenyon also declared (5 T. R., 276) "that the right of pressing is founded on the common law, and extends to all persons exercising employment in the seafaring line, and that in order to be exempt a positive statute must be shown." Barrington, in his observations on ancient statutes (p. 334, 5 Ed.) shows that the Crown anciently exercised a similar power of impressing men for the land service, not only for the army, but for the King's pleasure. I refer you also to 9 East., 466; 3 East., 477; 14 East., 346, and 2 Cowp., 320, for a variety of decisions, up to a late period, on this subject, and in favor of the power as applied to the navy. Many attempts have been made in the House of Commons to take away this power from the Crown, which have uniformly failed; but if there be any hope of continued peace the effort will no doubt succeed; but the principle of a forced service in the navy and army as a war measure will never be surrendered by Great Britain.*

Now I ask what is there in this history to justify the position that a convention which in 1787 had before it the miserable system of the old confederation, which required the United States to call upon the States for quotas of men and money, should, in giving power to construct an army for a firmer

---

* NOTE.—Lord Chatham said, in 1770, "I am myself clearly convinced, and believe every man who knows anything of the English navy will acknowledge, that without impressing, it is impossible to equip a respectable fleet within the time in which such armaments are usually wanted." Parli. Hist., XVI., 1101.

Union, intend to rely on what is far worse, in point of imbecility, than a call upon States—the mere power to authorize the agents of the government to contract with individuals to take part in the public defence? Shall it be said that popular wars only shall be engaged in, and that in such wars men will enlist? The effort to put down the rebellion you concede to be of this character, and yet, though the power of the North is ample, though men are plenty and are wanted, enlistment is slow and thus far is insufficient.

The power conferred on Congress to raise armies would be wholly ineffectual, if voluntary enlistments were the only means allowed, and inasmuch as the power relates to the grand arbitrament of war; to the the life or death of the Government as the result, it may be, of the mightiest struggles; it is an inevitable conclusion that it was intended to be ample for whatever contingencies may arise. The war power from its very nature must embrace whatever in organization and discipline are found necessary in other countries. If the nation is fettered in this respect, so as to be able to employ only what was known prior to 1787, we must ever be at the mercy of the great powers of the world which may organize and discipline their armies on better principles. The Constitution, instead of conferring the power to raise armies, would in that case contain no more power than would be required to raise rather a monument over its fallen greatness.

In looking up these authorities I find many facts going to explain the reason for the enumeration in our Constitution of the various national objects for which the militia of the several States may be called forth, such as the refusal of the militia of counties in England to go beyond their several precincts to take part in putting down a rebellion—and the ground that the militia of districts was purely local, and could not, especially, be ordered outside of the Kingdom. The contests, with respect to our own militia in some of the States of the Union of a like description, are also well known. The framers of the Constitution had in the convention, associates who partook largely of the disease of State rights, and I submit, that if there had not been specific authority to call forth the militia for national purposes, the power would have been denied, and yet, although

this was the danger to be guarded against by such enumeration, the fact of such enumeration—adopted for greater caution—is now used to weaken the authority of the Government at a vital point. But this article is already so long, that I forbear to say more, than that it is apparent, that the historical facts are clear in support of the position that the policy of a forced draft was employed extensively by important ancient powers; that it is still adhered to as a necessary auxiliary of war by nearly every modern nation; that the power to *raise* armies conferred on Congress, is a power to raise them in whatever manner may be usual and effectual to the end; that the authority "to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution" the specified powers, permits Congress to make, from time to time, a choice of means appropriate to the end—this being one of the means—and that the authority to call out the militia for certain specific purposes, is cumulative, and in no manner restricts or affects the power to raise armies, which is commensurate with all the manifold exigencies of the country.

G. B. B.

No. 3.

(From the Journal of Commerce. Published Nov. 24th.)

THE CONSCRIPTION ACT.

Messrs. Editors,—As I have none of the presumptions in my favor which gentlemen occupying the editorial chair possess, I feel obliged, instead of taking much for granted, to prove my case as fully as possible, and perhaps with a particularity which many skillful readers will deem unnecessary. But for this reason I should not have thought it necessary to present any authorities for the proposition, to the mode of stating which you except, "that it is a fundamental feature of every government that it is entitled to the services of its citizens, and if not rendered by choice their performance may be compelled." Permit me to present from opposite sources, the assertion of nearly the same fundamental maxim. The first Constitution of New York, made in 1777, when men were patriots, declared "that it is the duty of every man who enjoys the protection of society to be prepared and willing to defend it," and Lord Ashburton, in reply to Mr. Webster, observes, with respect to the policy formerly practiced of manning the British navy by impressment, that "the principle is, that all subjects of the Crown are, in case of necessity, bound to serve their country, and the seafaring man is naturally taken for the naval service," and adds, "this is not, as is sometimes supposed, an arbitrary principle of monarchical government, but one founded on the natural duty of every man to defend the life of his country."

The assertion by me of this fundamental feature, of liability for service as the result of protection, you have noticed as if I had insisted that "*all* fundamental features" of government appertained to the National Constitution, which was by no means

the case, as will appear from the language used, which is precisely quoted above. It is material that the force of this general truth shall not escape attention, for where there is a conceded obligation of duty, the supposed hardship and impropriety of enforcing it disappears. The question to be considered is, to which government, the State or National, is this obligation of service, to be enforced by conscription if need be, due? I shall claim that it follows the particular power to which it relates, and that as the power to provide for the public defence is devolved on the General Government, the duty of obedience in this matter, is to that government. You, Messrs. Editors, observed, with respect to my former articles that they were deficient in not considering sufficiently the power of the State in this respect, and I shall therefore examine the question more in that view. There is a wide difference between us, but it must be regarded as material that you admit that the right of conscription resides somewhere in our system. What, then, are the rights of the several States over it? The preamble of the National Constitution declares one of its objects to be to provide for the public defence. To accomplish this purpose, important equally to each State, the power to declare war, "to provide and maintain a navy," and "to raise and support armies," was expressly conferred, and the States were especially restricted, except with "the consent of Congress," from "keeping troops or ships of war in time of peace," entering "into any agreement or compact with another State or with a foreign power," or engaging "in war unless actually invaded or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay." Secession commenced its irregular work by sending from South Carolina Commissioners to reside near (such was the phrase) the State of Virginia, &c., in order to form some agreement or compact for united action; although this was expressly forbidden by the Constitution, which it would not have been, if the theory is a correct one, that any important power, with respect to public defence, had been allowed to remain in the several States. The Constitution, in this respect, is harmonious and complete. It committed the public defence, permanently, to the General Government, and I insist that the uniform practice of the several States, with respect to the

militia, confirms this theory of the government, and overthrows the one, which you, Messrs. Editors, sustain. Our State militia law, passed anterior to the present war, provides that "the organization of the militia in divisions, brigades, regiments, battalions, squadrons, troops and companies, shall be conformable "*to the provisions of the laws of the United States*," and that the several assessors shall include in their assessment roll all persons between the ages of 18 and 45, "*liable to be enrolled by laws of the United States.*" The substance of the Act passed by this State was adopted and adhered to by the several States. It is based on the Act of Congress of 1792, '5, which declares what persons shall be enrolled in the militia, prescribing the extreme ages; how they shall be formed into a manageable and uniform force; and how they shall be armed and equipped; but the States reserved "the appointment of officers and the authority of training the militia," which latter was to be done, however (such is the language of the Constitution), "according to the discipline prescribed by Congress." With respect, also, to a forced draft in this State, the Act of our Legislature (passed before the war) provides in terms, that "whenever the President of the United States, or the Commander-in-Chief, shall *order a draft* from the militia for public service, such draft shall be made in the following manner," which manner is then expressed.

In looking over the proceedings of the Convention of 1829 for amending the Constitution of the State of Virginia, I was not a little struck with the proceedings with respect to the militia. In the convention were two Ex-Presidents, Madison and Monroe; the equally celebrated Chief Justice Marshall; the great stickler for State rights John Randolph, and many others distinguished on the bench, at the bar—the almost unequalled bar of Virginia—and in Congress. The only provision introduced into the Constitution of the State, framed by these eminent men, was a provision reported by Mr. Madison, one of the most conspicuous authors of the National Constitution, and also of the Federalist, the latter a work which constitutes a monument of wisdom unsurpassed by any on government now known. The provision adopted was merely this: "The manner of appointing militia officers shall be provided for by law; but

no officer below the rank of a Brigadier-General shall be appointed by the General Assembly." The subsequent provision, "commissions and grants, shall run in the name of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and bear test by the Governor, with the seal of the Commonwealth annexed," had reference to other appointments than those that were merely military, but the framers of that constitution by this provision meant that it should be known, that whatsoever power she exercised over the militia, should appear to every officer under her broad seal. It is scarcely to be supposed that this State, ever jealous of the exercise of any power by the General Government, not expressly granted; scrupulous in insisting on the exercise of those that were retained by the State and the reputed author of the celebrated amendment you quote, protecting unnecessarily, the reserved rights, should have been content with merely the single provision adopted by the Convention of 1829, if the large powers which you, Messrs. Editors, contend for as residing in the States, with respect to this arm of the public service, had actually existed. The Constitution of the State of New York as adopted in '77, in '23, and lastly in '46, contains no other than a like provision with respect to officers of the militia.

I come now to the important question, Why this uniform forbearance in State constitutions to cover more ground on this subject? The answer is quite conclusive. The act of Congress of 1792, '5, covered the ground of the persons who should be enrolled in the militia; the mode of forming them into a convenient public force, and how those persons should be severally armed and equipped; and it has been decided in effect by the Supreme Court of the United States, that even if the power of the States over some of these subjects of legislation had before been concurrent with that of the General Government, the legislation of Congress had concluded the States from exercising independent power of a different character over the same subject matter. And why this act of Congress? The Constitution of the United States authorized Congress in terms "to provide for *organizing*, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training

the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress." § 8, sub. 15.

I am justified therefore in the conclusion—from the fact of the introduction into the Virginia Constitution of a clause providing merely for the appointment of militia officers; the adoption of that and no other clause by that jealous, scrupulous, and able convention; the appearance in the State constitution of New York, of only a like provision; the introduction into other, and, indeed, all the State constitutions, of clauses, if not consistent, at least not inconsistent, with its tenor, and the precise conformity of all State legislation to the material parts of the act of Congress of 1792, '5,—that this is the conceded interpretation of the National Constitution, and that the States now possess only a subsidiary power over the militia.*

And now, I ask you, Messrs. Editors, if your ground—utterly inconsistent as it is with the uniform tenor of this history—is correct, that the States retained the vital power of deciding who shall be enrolled in the public service and in what manner they shall be enrolled, and should decide that only those shall be enrolled between the ages of 60 and 70, and they only by voluntary enlistment, (a measure which, though not reasonable except as a cover for treason, we have seen, there are a plenty to resort to,) how, I ask, could the General Government, intrusted with the duty of providing "for the public defence," and authorized alone to declare war, perform efficiently these duties to the country?

Were the means to be inadequate to the end? Were the framers of the Constitution guilty of the folly of prescribing duties and omitting sufficient powers? Was the government at the first signal of war to prove itself dependent on States, when this was the very mischief and defect which they intended to remedy of the old Confederation? Did they intend to confide to the States the whole power over the enrollment of men when the Constitution stripped the States of all the great attributes of a system of defence—of the treaty power; of the power to impose and collect ordinary duties; of the power to keep troops

* In some of the Constitutions, the Governor is appointed commander-in-chief of what is called the army and navy of the State, which he would be in the *excepted case*, but in other respects this is "high sounding."

or ships of war in time of peace, except with the consent of Congress? or rather did they not in establishing a Constitution "to *ensure* domestic tranquillity, *provide* for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and *secure* the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," intend by the granted powers to accomplish these purposes?

The restriction on the States against keeping "troops or ships of war in time of peace" has another important effect, as it prevents those opportunities of practice and application in the science of war which are constantly furnished to the regular forces, in the naval ships and forts of the Union, and by which the complete discipline, so essential as a preparation for war, is afforded to both officers and men. The States thus completely fettered in the means of preparation and discipline, can never be ready themselves to take nor to aid the General Government to take, a decisive and prompt part in the great game of war, for which most important nations are ever prepared; but yet you contend that the States possess fully the right of forced levies, and that the General Government is stripped wholly of this power. In war, the combined and concentrated energies of one nation are arrayed against the collected forces of another, and *as there can be no limitation on the power of attack, there can be none on the means for defence.* The means of offence of foreign nations embrace the rapidity, certainty and completeness of forced levies. They thus overcome the obstacles to enlistment, resulting from the averson of individuals to war, and their deeper interest in the ordinary pursuits of life. The United States would be weak beyond all example, if, after a solemn declaration of war, every individual citizen, sitting in his easy chair, might annul the decision as to himself, by refusing to take part in the conflict, and coolly treating the question as one "of contract" between himself and his country. This theory must be rejected as wholly untenable.*

---

* Mr. Calhoun as late as Aug. 1, '41, in his speech on the distribution bill, says, speaking of the powers of the Union (see IV. vol. of his works):

"Where strength is required its powers are undivided. In its exterior relations —abroad—this government is the sole and exclusive representative of the united majesty, sovereighty and power of the States, constituting this great and glorious Union. To the rest of the world *we are one.* Neither State nor State Govern-

In presenting these arguments, Messrs. Editors, I have not traveled a step beyond the obvious meaning of the Constitution as derived from its precise language. Whatever authority is urged as appertaining to the General Government, must be shown in terms, or by necessary and proper implication. My position was—and I repeat it, that the specified power "to *raise* and support armies" is complete, and includes, according to all conceded rules of interpretation, full and ample power to *raise* them in whatever manner may be necessary and proper to the end. It is you, Messrs. Editors, who would strip this well-understood verb of its ordinary meaning, and impart to it one not found in any work whatever,—one which enables refractory States to obstruct and defeat the National power of defence,—basing your interpretation upon a supposed historical understanding of its use in England or elsewhere, without presenting a single authority for the position, an omission which permits me to assume that there are none. I rest the case, therefore, not upon the want of authority over the subject in the several States which this article presents, and I think conclusively, but upon the plain import of the power "to *raise* armies," plain to the comprehension of the most ordinary intellect, and recommended for that reason for adoption; this being, doubtless, one of the reasons for the perfect clearness, brevity and simplicity of the Constitution. It is wholly immaterial, in this view, whether the additional authority conferred on Congress to provide for organizing the militia of the several States, does or does not include the power to draft, exclusively of the States, after a like power shall have been exercised by Congress; because, if the power to draft is conferred under the authority to raise armies, that alone is sufficient. There may be differences of opinion as to the meaning of the word "organize," whether it means to form with suitable organs, or to distribute into parts and appoint the proper officers, but this need not be considered more fully. The power to organize has been treated universally as meaning a power to regulate exclusively, and the whole practice of the

---

ments are known beyond our borders." * * * The first of these are those that are necessary to the discharge of its exterior functions, such as declaring war, *raising armies*, providing a navy and raising revenue."

government, State and National, has been of the uniform character described, of States following immediately and implicitly in the line prescribed by Congress with respect to the militia, and it will scarcely now be allowable to reverse this well considered action of the machinery of government on a suggestion that possibly the word might have another than the interpretation on which this action is based, and more particularly as a change in this respect might tend to introduce confusion, while now the duty of providing for the public defence and the means for accomplishing it are one, uniform and sufficient.

I may possibly be asked whether the several States would not be exposed improperly to attacks if they do not possess the power to form their militia independently of the General Government. The answer to this is sufficient. "The United States (says the Constitution) shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and, on application of the legislature or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence." These stipulations constituted the equivalent to the States for surrendering power over the public defence, and they give their force to the conviction that it would be an anomaly, not supposable, to require these important duties without conferring adequate means to perform them.

"The disease of State rights" to which I referred, is the morbid effort to strip the United States of its just authority in order to augment the power of the States. It commenced in the effort to amend the Constitution by the introduction of a bill of rights (the ten amendments), on the erroneous principle that the Constitution contained a mass of hidden powers, although by all just rules of construction the powers must be found to be enforced. In the State Constitutions bills of rights are necessary, because the grants of executive and legislative power they contain are broad and general, and the exceptions are expressed. A bill of rights affixes bounds to this otherwise unlimited authority in State Constitutions, but in no degree limits or was intended to limit the declared powers contained in the National Constitution, or those necessary and proper to carry them into effect. I doubt if you can point to a single advantage to the reserved

powers, derived from these amendments in the National Constitution. The reserved powers were equally such with or without them, nor have they been enlarged or protected by these amendments, which, on the contrary, were dangerous from the assumption they justified of the existence of powers that were neither expressed nor implied; but yet factions have arisen, acting with more than common zeal, for the alleged preservation of these reserved rights, which they drag forth on all occasions of dispute. This phantom, still "rising as the mists arise," was the unsubstantial foundation upon which the heresy of secession was raised, and will appear to disturb the imagination until rebellion shall be crushed, and the country shall march forward, as she soon will, on her old career of glory.

The old confederation acted almost exclusively on and through the states, but it is a distinctive and admitted feature of the present Constitution that it acts directly upon the citizen, and it follows that in every case in which there exists a right and power in the Constitution there is a correlative duty on the part of the citizen, and I hold, therefore, as the public defence is committed to the National Government, that conceded obligation of service which they owe who receive protection, and which I have called a fundamental feature, is due in that matter to the National Government.

I beg leave to say, before closing, that, far from defending, as you allege, impressment, as practiced by the British Government, it has been stigmatized throughout as being despotic. The sole object of referring to it was to meet your ground that in Great Britain the power to raise armies was understood to mean merely the power to contract for soldiers, and hence became somewhat of a precedent or authority for arriving at the meaning of our Constitution. The contract mode was a mode of providing for her defense in what has ever constituted her chief means of defense—her navy—which she used when it accomplished her purpose, chiefly in peace, but uniformly rejected when impressment better answered the necessities of war.* Her practice of impress-

* Note.—May in his recent work, the Constitutional History of England, says, (vol. II., p. 259): "But perhaps the greatest anomaly in our laws—the most sig-

ing seamen, defended by her courts, and in actual operation in 1787, was relied upon to show that the framers of the Constitution had no such precedent of meekness in her history, as to give a historical meaning to the power to raise armies such as destroyed its efficacy in our Constitution. Apologizing for the space I have occupied, and thanking you for your courtesy, I now take leave of the subject.

G. B. B.

---

nal exception to personal freedom—is to be found in the custom of impressment for the land and sea service. There is nothing incompatible with freedom in a forced levy of men for the defence of the country. It may be submitted to in the freest republic, like the payment of taxes. The services of every subject may be required in such form as the State determines. But impressment is the arbitrary and capricious seizure of individuals from among the great body of citizens. It differs from conscription *as a particular confiscation* differs from a general tax."

The Loyal Publication Society has already issued a large number of Slips and Pamphlets which have been widely circulated. Amongst the most important are the following:

No. 1. Future of the North West, by *Robert Dale Owen.*
2. Echo from the Army.
3. Union Mass Meeting, Speeches of *Brady, Van Buren, &c*
4. Three Voices: the Soldier, Farmer and Poet.
5. Voices from the Army.
6. Northern True Men.
7. Speech of Major-General Butler.
8. Separation; War without End. *Ed. Laboulaye.*
9. The Venom and the Antidote.
10. A few words in behalf of the Loyal Women of the United States, by *One of Themselves.*
11. No Failure for the North. *Atlantic Monthly.*
12. Address to King Cotton. *Eugene Pelletan.*
13. How a Free People conduct a long War. *Stillé.*
14. The Preservation of the Union, a National Economic Necessity.
15. Elements of Discords in Secessia, &c., &c.
16. No Party now, but all for our Country. *Francis Lieber.*
17. The Cause of the War. *Col. Charles Anderson.*
18. Opinions of the early Presidents and of the Fathers of the Republic upon Slavery, and upon Negroes as Men and Soldiers.
19. Einheit und Freiheit, von Hermann Rafter.
20. Military Despotism! Suspension of the Habeas Corpus! &c.
21. Letter addressed to the Opera-House Meeting, Cincinnati, by *Col. Charles Anderson.*
22. Emancipation is Peace. *By Robert Dale Owen.*
23. Letter of Peter Cooper on Slave Emancipation.
24. Patriotism. Sermon by the *Rev. Jos. Fransioli*, of St. Peter's (Catholic) Church, Brooklyn.
25. The Conditions of Reconstruction, by *Robert Dale Owen.*
26. Letter to the President, by *Gen. A. J. Hamilton*, of Texas.
27. Nullification and Compromise: a Retrospective View.
28. The Death of Slavery. Letter from Peter Cooper to Gov. Seymour.
29. Slavery Plantations and the Yeomanry. By *Francis Lieber.*
30. Rebel Conditions of Peace.
31. Address of the Loyal Leagues.
32. War Power of the President—Summary Imprisonment— by *J. Heermans.*
33. The Two Ways of Treason.
34. The Monroe Doctrine, by Edward Everett, &c.
35. The Arguments of Secessionists.
36. Prophecy and Fulfilment. Letter of A. H. Stephens—Address of E. W. Gantt.
37. How the South Rejected Compromise, &c.
38. Letters on our National Struggle. By *Brigadier. General Thomas Francis Meagher.*

Loyal Leagues, Clubs, or individuals may obtain any of our Publications at the cost price, by application to the Executive Committee, or by calling at the Rooms of the Society, No. 863 Broadway, where all information may be obtained relating to the Society.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 41.

RÉPONSE

DE

MM. De GASPARIN, LABOULAYE MARTIN ET COCHIN,

A LA

LIGUE LOYALE ET NATIONALE

DE

NEW YORK.

NEW YORK:

DE L'IMPRIMERIE DE WM. C. BRYANT & CO., 41 RUE NASSAU, AU COIN DE LIBERTY.

1864.

La lettre suivante de MM. de Gasparin, Laboulaye, Cochin et Martin a été écrite en réponse à l'adresse de la Ligue Loyale Nationale de New York, adresse adoptée au "Mass Meeting" convoqué à "Union Square," le 11 Avril, 1863, et envoyée à Paris en Mai dernier. Les personnes qui désireront prendre connaissance de l'adresse pourront s'en procurer des exemplaires s'ils en font la demande au bureau de la Société des Publications Loyales, Broadway, No. 863, à partir du 10 Janvier, 1864.

LETTRE DE M. LABOULAYE.

PARIS, 14 *Novembre*, 1863.

A MR. LIEBER.

Mon cher Collègue,

Mr. Ruggles a la bonté de se charger de notre réponse à l'honorable adresse que vous nous avez envoyée. Ayez la bonté de la communiquer à la Ligue, et excusez nous, si nous ne vous avons pas remerciés plus tôt. M. De Gasparin était en Orient, il nous a fallu attendre son retour.

Croyez moi, avec une profonde sympathie,

Votre tout dévoué,

ED. LABOULAYE.

34 Rue Taitbout.

RÉPONSE

A LA LETTRE ADRESSÉE A

MM. LE COMTE DE GASPARIN, EDOUARD LABOULAYE, HENRI MARTIN, AUGUSTIN COCHIN, ET AUTRES AMIS DE L'AMERIQUE EN FRANCE,

PAR LA

LIGUE LOYALE ET NATIONALE

DE NEW YORK.

MESSIEURS,

Nous aurions voulu vous remercier beaucoup plus tôt; l'absence prolongée de l'un de nous ne l'a pas permis. Il nous en eût coûté de ne pas conserver à cette réponse son caractère collectif, car le rapprochement de nos quatre noms manifeste cette grande unité, qui, grâce à Dieu, s'établit ici bas en matière de justice, malgré les diversités politiques et religieuses.

Nous n'avons garde au reste de nous méprendre sur notre importance personnelle. Ce n'est pas à nous que s'adresse la Ligue; elle parle à la France, où l'amitié des Etats-Unis est une tradition nationale; elle parle à l'opinion Européenne, qui s'animera et se prononcera toujours davantage à mesure qu'elle reconnaîtra qu'il s'agit d'une lutte entre l'esclavage et la liberté.

Vous l'avez compris, Messieurs, ni la France ni l'Europe n'ont été à l'abri de malentendus; la lumière ne s'est pas faite dès la

première heure sur la nature de la crise salutaire et douloureuse que vous traversez ; tout le monde n'a pas vu sur le champ que ceci était une nouvelle guerre de l'Indépendance, que l'œuvre inaugurée par l'élection de M. Lincoln ne le cédait pas en grandeur à celle que vos pères ont accomplie avec l'aide de Lafayette, et sous la conduite de Washington.

L'Europe a eu des erreurs, des hésitations que nous payons maintenant bien cher sur les deux rives de l'Atlantique. Que de sang aurait été épargné chez vous, que de souffrances industrielles auraient été évitées chez nous, si l'opinion Européenne s'était prononcée avec cet élan qu'il semblait permis d'espérer. Il est telle protestation de la conscience universelle devant laquelle on recule nécessairement ; les forces morales sont, quoi qu'on fasse, les grandes forces.

Le Sud révolté, qui avait besoin de nous, qui a compté, qui compte peut-être encore sur nous, n'aurait pas affronté longtemps l'indignation du monde civilisé.

I.

Pourquoi cette indignation a-t-elle fait défaut ? Pourquoi une sorte de faveur s'est-elle attachée à la seule insurrection qui n'ait eu ni motif ni prétexte, à la seule qui ait osé déployer le drapeau de l'esclavage ? Quel genre de mérite a-t-elle eu, cette insurrection ? Par quel charme a-t-elle pu se concilier les sympathies de plus d'un esprit élevé ? C'est une question qu'il est humiliant de poser, mais qu'il est utile de résoudre.

En premier lieu, l'Europe s'est prise à douter que l'esclavage fût la cause réelle du conflit. Doute étrange, en vérité ! Depuis plusieurs années l'esclavage était le grand, l'unique sujet de lutte aux États-Unis. Lors de l'élection de M. Buchanan on ne s'était occupé que de l'esclavage. Les programmes électoraux en font foi, les manifestes du Sud étaient unanimes en ce sens ; ses chefs

de parti, ses gouverneurs, ses assemblées délibérantes, ses journaux avaient parlé de l'esclavage et pas d'autre chose ; le Vice-Président de la confédération insurgée s'était empressé de déclarer officiellement que la mission du nouvel État était de présenter à l'admiration des hommes une société fondée sur "*la pierre angulaire*" de l'esclavage ; enfin, pour quiconque avait un peu de mémoire, il semble que les actes de M. Buchanan et des autres Présidents nommés par le Sud étaient des preuves suffisantes de cette vérité. Le Sud ne pense qu'à l'esclavage, tout lui est bon pour assurer les triomphes de l'esclavage, les conquêtes indéfinies de l'esclavage.

Mais, objectait-on, M. Lincoln et ses amis n'étaient pas des abolitionnistes. Cela est certain, leur programme n'allait qu'à arrêter l'extension de l'esclavage, à lui fermer les territoires. N'était-ce rien ? N'était-ce pas tout au fond ? Qui eût pu prévoir qu'à l'apparition d'un tel programme, d'un progrès si inattendu, d'une attaque si hardie contre la politique qui abaissait et perdait les États-Unis, les amis de la liberté ne se hâteraient pas tous d'applaudir ? N'était-ce pas le cas d'encourager, d'affermir ceux qui entraient ainsi dans la bonne voie ? Ne fallait-il pas les pousser dans le sens de leur tendance liberale, afin qu'ayant fait le premier pas, ils fissent aussi le second, et qu'ils allassent jusqu'au bout ? Ce qui épouvantait et consternait les champions de l'esclavage, ne devait-il pas réjouir ses adversaires ?

Votre lettre met en saillie, Messieurs, les raisons qui ont empêché M. Lincoln d'adopter sur-le-champ une politique abolitionniste. Le Président ne pouvait oublier ni son serment, ni la constitution fédérale, il devait tenir compte aussi des résistances que rencontraient au sein des Etats fidèles les plans d'émancipation. Le chef d'un grand gouvernement n'agit pas avec la liberté d'allure que possède un philosophe dans son cabinet. En bonne justice, M. Lincoln ne saurait être accusé de timidité ou d'indifférence, lui dont la Présidence a été marquée par les

mesures que rappelle votre lettre : l'abolition de l'esclavage dans la capitale et dans le district de Colombie, la liberté proclamée des esclaves fugitifs, le principe de l'émancipation avec indemnité posé pour tous les Etats fidèles, la peine de mort appliquée aux capitaines des vaisseaux négriers, le traité avec l'Angleterre admettant le droit de visite, les relations diplomatiques établies avec les républiques noires de Libéria et d'Haïti, l'armement des nègres libres, enfin, lorsque la durée et la gravité de la guerre ont autorisé cette conséquence extrême des pouvoirs du général en chef, la suppression absolue et definitive de l'esclavage dans tous les Etats révoltés.

Nous sommes abolitionnistes, Messieurs ; or, nous le déclarons, nous n'avons jamais espéré ni désiré une marche plus ferme, plus rapide, ou plus résolue. Nous avons compris les difficultés que rencontrait M. Lincoln ; nous avons honoré les scrupules de conscience qui l'ont arrêté en face de la Constitution de son pays ; nous avons admiré le bon-sens courageux avec lequel il a su marcher en avant, dès l'instant où il pouvait le faire sans compromettre sa cause et sans violer les lois.

On s'est étonné de voir l'esclavage aboli au sein des Etats révoltés et conservé au sein des Etats loyaux ! En d'autres termes, on s'est étonné de voir la Constitution respectée par celui qui a juré de lui obéir. Qu'on se tranquillise d'ailleurs, il n'y a pas de risque que "*l'institution domestique*," supprimée dans les Carolines et dans la Louisiane subsiste longtemps dans le Kentucky ou dans le Maryland. Déjà, vous nous l'avez dit, une proposition solennelle a été faite à tous les Etats fidèles ; déjà l'un d'eux et l'un des plus importants, le Missouri, a donné l'exemple de l'acceptation. Il faut, pour s'inquiéter ainsi du maintien de l'esclavage dans le Nord avoir, ce semble, bien des tendresses pour le Sud. Il nous est suspect cet abolitionnisme prétendu dont les exigences hostiles sont nées précisément le jour où commençait en Amérique l'aurore de l'abolition. Nous n'aurions jamais prévu, quant à nous, que l'élection de M. Lincoln et les divers

actes que nous venons d'énumérer dussent être pour beaucoup d'hommes qui font état en Europe de détester l'esclavage, un sujet incessant de douleurs, de méfiances, de dénonciations indignes.

A la vérité, comme pour perdre le Nord dans l'opinion, il ne suffisait pas tout-à-fait de le présenter comme trop favorable à l'esclavage, on a inventé un autre grief: le Nord opprimait le Sud! Il y avait là deux nationalités en lutte. Le Sud s'est levé pour l'indépendance!

L'indépendance? Il y avait donc des contrées asservies au sein de l'Union? Sans doute ces contrées ne participaient pas au gouvernement du pays; le Sud n'avait pas les mêmes droits que le Nord? Sans doute le Sud était maintenu dans cet état d'infériorité et d'oppression par de nombreuses garnisons fédérales? Eh bien, non. Tous les Etats possédaient les mêmes droits, prenaient part aux mêmes élections. Si quelqu'un était favorisé, c'était le Sud auquel des suffrages exceptionnels étaient accordés en raison du nombre de ses esclaves. Si quelqu'un avait eu une supériorité, c'était le Sud, qui avait fourni la plupart des Présidents et des principaux magistrats. Et c'est dans ce pays libre, dans ce pays sans armée et où les moyens matériels aussi bien que les lois auraient fait défaut à l'oppression, c'est dans un tel pays qu'on nous parle d'une région revendiquant l'indépendance!

Nous pensons avec vous, Messieurs, qu'il ne faut pas abuser de ces nobles mots, *indépendance*, *nationalité*. En abusant des mots, on compromet les choses, et plus ces choses sont nobles et sacrées, plus nous devons nous garder de les confondre avec ce qui n'est ni noble ni sacré; la révolte au nom de l'esclavage, la révolte fratricide, qui essaie de tuer une constitution libre et de déchirer la patrie commune parcequ'elle a craint qu'on ne génât la traite intérieure, les remontes d'hommes et de femmes en Virginie, la vente en détail des familles, parcequ'elle a craint qu'on ne fermât quelques territoires aux conquêtes de l'esclavage.

En vain chercherait on à découvrir aux Etats-Unis une nationalité voulant recouvrer son indépendance. Non seulement l'indépendance n'a reçu aucune atteinte, mais la nationalité distincte fait absolument défaut. Nulle part, peut-être, l'homogénéité nationale n'est plus complète. Du Nord au Sud, on rencontre la même race, les mêmes croyances, la même langue, la même histoire, et, nous osons le dire, les mêmes intérêts. Tous ces Etats ont lutté ensemble, souffert ensemble, triomphé ensemble. Leurs gloires, leurs défaites sont communes. Leur constitution est librement sortie du consentement de tous. Tous ont pris l'engagement de lui demeurer fidèles.

Cet engagement ne saurait être un vain mot dont chacun se joue, à son gré. Parmi les inventions de notre époque, il n'en est pas de plus extraordinaire que le *droit de séparation.* Ceux qui l'ont imaginé nous apprendront sans doute où il doit s'arrêter. Si les régions ont un droit de séparation à l'égard du pays entier, pourquoi chaque État n'aurait-il pas un droit de séparation à l'égard de ces régions? Pourquoi chaque Comté n'aurait il pas un droit de séparation à l'égard de l'État? Pourquoi chaque Ville n'aurait elle pas un droit de séparation à l'égard du Comté? Pourquoi chaque citoyen n'aurait il pas un droit de séparation à l'égard de la Ville?

Le fait est que, sans l'esclavage, le Sud ne parlerait ni de son indépendance opprimée, ni de son droit de séparation. L'esclavage a mis aux prises les deux régions; la suppression de l'esclavage rétablira l'unité. Le Nord et le Sud s'étonneront un jour d'avoir pu méconnaître une des nationalités les plus complètes et les plus homogènes qu'il y ait ici bas.

Reste une dernière ressource: Pour éviter de voir ici la grande lutte au sujet de l'esclavage on s'attache à nous montrer une lutte au sujet de la domination.

Mais cette lutte, c'est la vie même des pays libres. Que le Nord et le Sud aient cherché activement, énergiquement, bruyamment à faire passer leurs candidats et prévaloir leur politi-

que personne ne saurait s'en étonner. Seulement, si l'un d'eux, ayant perdu la bataille du scrutin, ne craint pas d'engager une autre bataille, s'il proteste les armes à la main contre une élection régulière, si le jour où il cesse de dominer, il déchire la patrie commune, il commet un des attentats auxquels il serait difficile de trouver une excuse.

II.

Vous triompherez de la revolte, Messieurs, vous parviendrez, nous le croyons du moins, au rétablissement de l'Union, elle sortira de cette sanglante épreuve plus forte, plus libre, plus digne des nobles destins auxquels Dieu l'appelle.

On nous a *démontré*, il est vrai, que le rétablissement de l'Union était impossible ; mais ne nous a-t-on pas *démontré* aussi, et par des arguments irréfutables que vous seriez nécessairement et toujours battus, que vous ne sauriez jamais tenir un fusil, que vos recrutements deviendraient impraticables, que vos finances s'épuiseraient, que vos emprunts ne se placeraient pas, que vous recourriez à la banqueroute, que l'émeute ravagerait toutes vos villes, que votre gouvernement serait renversé. Vous avez fait à tous ces oracles la plus simple et la meilleure des réponses ; vous répondrez de la même manière à ceux qui décident que le rétablissement de l'Union est impossible.

Ce qui semble presque impossible, c'est de ne pas rétablir l'Union. Où découvrir une frontière entre le Nord et le Sud ? Comment maintenir entre eux un état de paix, ou seulement de trève ? Comment faire vivre côte à côte l'esclavage et la liberté ? Comment, d'autrepart, soustraire le Sud aux protectorats Européens, et par quel moyen arrêter les conséquences effrayantes de ces protectorats ? Géographiquement, moralement, politiquement, la séparation créerait une situation contre nature, une de ces situations violentes, précaires, où chacun demeure l'arme au bras, attendant l'heure du conflit.

Nous avons cette confiance, Messieurs, qu'une telle épreuve vous sera épargnée. Ce n'est pas que nous méconnaissions les difficultés qui vous restent à vaincre, elles sont grandes, plus grandes peut-être que nous ne l'imaginons. La guerre a ses alternatives et vous serez peut-être appelés à traverser encore des périodes d'insuccès. Toutefois, un fait demeure, et montre de quel côté, (à supposer qu'il n'y ait point d'intervention étrangère,) doit se trouver le triomphe final. Le drapeau de l'Union n'a cessé d'avancer depuis deux ans. Il flotte aujourd'hui sur le sol de tous les Etats révoltés sans exception ; le Sud a eu des victoires, il n'a jamais gagné un pouce de terrain ; le Nord a eu des défaites, il n'a jamais reculé. Maître aujourd'hui du cours entier du Mississippi, maître des États limitrophes et de la Louisiane, il ne lui reste plus qu'à étouffer la révolte dans l'étroit territoire où elle a pris naissance, et où elle a été refoulée. Nous pensons qu'il y réussira, car l'Europe, cette unique espérance du Sud, parait être maintenant peu disposée à le secourir.

En résumé, la séparation est déjà réduite à des proportions telles, que si jamais elle se transformait en une Confédération distincte, acceptée de guerre lasse en cette qualité, la Confédération ainsi créée ne naîtrait pas viable. Ni la reconnaissance de l'Europe, ni la vôtre ne pourraient lui donner une chance sérieuse de durée, elle finirait par vous revenir. Mais nous aimons bien mieux considérer le rétablissement de l'Union comme moins lointain. Or, en présence de cette perspective qui fait battre nos cœurs, nous permettrez-vous, à nous, vos amis, de vous offrir de sincères conseils ? Les périls du triomphe, vous le savez, ne sont pas moindres que ceux du combat. Nous vous dirons donc loyalement notre pensée, persuadés qu'elle s'accordera presque toujours avec la vôtre, et sentant d'ailleurs que ces communications entre nous ont un but plus sérieux que ne le serait l'échange de quelques paroles de sympathie.

Nous croyons qu'il importe avant tout que la cause du conflit ne survive pas au conflit, que votre ennemi véritable, l'*Esclavage*,

reste sur le terrain. Souvent nous nous sommes demandés depuis trois années, pourquoi Dieu permettait la prolongation de cette lutte sanglante. N'était-ce pas pour que la vraie question achevât de se poser? Vainqueur plus vite, le Gouvernement Fédéral aurait été entraîné peut-être à faire des concessions, à rentrer dans la voie fatale des compromis. Maintenant les yeux de quiconque n'est pas volontairement aveugle, ont certes dû s'ouvrir. L'émeute de New York, éclatant à jour fixe pour seconder l'invasion de Lee, et courant sus aux nègres de façon à prouver à tous les spectateurs de ces lâchetés féroces de quel esprit certains amis du Sud étaient animés ; l'émeute de New York a été comme un avertissemeut suprême donné à votre pays. Votre ligne de conduite est nettement tracée. Tant qu'il y aura une question de l'esclavage, il y aura une cause d'antagonisme au sein de l'Union. Il faut qu'il n'y ait plus de question de l'Esclavage, il faut qu'elle soit réglée et achevée de façon à ne plus y revenir ; il faut que l'*amendement constitutionnel* à introduire sur ce point soit adopté avant la rentrée des États.

Il faut aussi que la situation des nègres libres soit mise à l'abri des iniquités dont ils ont eu si longtemps à souffrir. Plus de plans de colonisation au dehors, plus de bills d'exclusion, plus d'inégalité. Ceux que vous avez armés, ceux qui ont si vaillamment combattu devant les murailles de Port Hudson et du fort Wagner ne sauraient être désormais que des citoyens. Laissez le problème des races se résoudre tout seul ; les solutions les plus naturelles sont toujours les meilleures. Sous le régime du droit commun, les noirs libres du Sud et du Nord trouveront leur place légitime dans votre société, dont ils deviendront des membres utiles, honorables, et honorés.

En réglant ainsi d'une façon définitive ce qui tient à l'esclavage et à la race de couleur, vous aurez fait plus qu'on ne l'imagine en général pour la pacification durable du Sud. Ce qu'il vous restera à faire sur ce point se résume en ces trois mots : *Modération*, *Générosité*, *Liberté*.

Il ne saurait, vous l'avez dit bien des fois, être question d'occuper le Sud, de conquérir le Sud, de réduire les États du Sud à la condition de provinces, où le vainqueur tiendrait garnison, et où la vie publique serait suspendue. A part les districts ravagés encore par des guérillas, et au sein desquels les troupes fédérales devraient achever leur œuvre, la victoire amènera partout, avec le rétablissement de l'Union, le rétablissement aussi prompt que possible des droits constitutionnels. Vous aspirez, Messieurs, au moment où vos vaincus de la veille seront vos contradicteurs du lendemain, où (pour votre gloire) vous aurez accepté, dans leur vérité, les luttes de la presse, de la tribune, et du scrutin, venant remplacer les luttes des champs de bataille.

Il vaut bien mieux, nous le sentons tous, que vous ayez à subir les difficultés fécondes de la liberté que si vous vous procuriez les trompeurs avantages d'un régime dictatorial. Appliquer au Sud des mesures d'exception, ce serait, hélas! très facile. Il serait très facile aussi de prononcer des arrêts de mort, de proscrire, d'exécuter les bills de confiscation, mais en suivant cette voie de la tyrannie vulgaire, vous sacrifieriez deux choses; votre bonne renommée dans le présent, la durée de l'Union avec le Sud dans l'avenir.

Que si, au contraire, vous donnez au monde le spectacle bien nouveau d'une victoire sans représailles, d'une liberté assez forte pour survivre aux guerres civiles, si votre constitution subsiste, et si l'esclavage seul succombe dans un tel conflit, si, le lendemain de la lutte, la loi demeure souveraine, si les élections pour le Sénat et pour le Congrès s'ouvrent comme aux jours anciens, si les représentants des Etats Méridionaux reparaissent à Washington, si, moyennant le serment d'être fidèles à l'Union et de maintenir la constitution modifiée, ils se trouvent sur un pied d'égalité parfaite avec les représentants du Nord, s'il leur est loisible d'attaquer, de gêner le Gouvernement, vous aurez rem-

porté la plus belle de vos victoires et assuré à votre patrie les meilleures chances de prospérité et de grandeur.

Voyez, Messieurs, dans les conseils que nous vous adressons, une preuve de notre estime. Ce n'est pas à tous les gouvernements, ce n'est pas à tous les peuples qu'on pourrait demander ces choses là. Les guerres civiles prolongées entrainent des habitudes d'arbitraire, suscitent des passions et des haines, engendrent enfin un développement de la puissance militaire et de l'autorité irresponsable qui rendent en général malaisé le retour au contrôle, à la contradiction, à la stricte légalité. Nous honorons assez les Etats-Unis, pour croire qu'ils seront capables de nous donner cet exemple, après nous en avoir donné plusieurs autres.

La modération que nous espérons de vous au dedans, nous l'attendons aussi de vous au dehors. Certes, le lendemain de la soumission du Sud, il ne manquera pas de gens empressés à vous rappeler vos griefs, fondés ou non, contre telle ou telle puissance. On vous montrera vos armées et vos flottes disponibles. On vous prouvera qu'une guerre extérieure est peut-être le plus sur moyen de rapprocher les deux régions naguère hostiles, on vous dira qu'une haine commune, des périls communs, sont le ciment nécessaire à l'affermissement de votre édifice ébranlé.

Vous ne le croirez pas, Messieurs. Vous sentirez qu'après ces secousses, il importe avant tout de rendre à l'Amérique la paix et la liberté. Vous n'irez pas courir de nouvelles aventures et prolonger la tentation des dictatures, le péril des régimes d'exception.

Vous craindrez de rentrer dans la politique agressive, envahissante, et turbulente que vous imposaient les influences du Sud, à l'heure où pour assurer l'extension de l'esclavage, il éveillait chez vous les mauvaises convoitises et vous poussait presque à violer le droit des gens. Votre gloire sera de prendre le contrepied de ces déclarations violentes de ces expéditions de flibustiers, de ces ambitions sans scrupule.

Les tentations que crée une grande armée sont au nombre de celles qu'il est le plus difficile de réprimer. Puissiez-vous ne pas hésiter à réduire vos forces après la paix ! désarmer, diminuer la dépense, revenir vers l'idéal ancien des petites armées et des petits budgets, cela n'importera pas seulement à votre prospérité matérielle, mais aussi à votre liberté.

Nous ne nous le dissimulons pas, vos petites armées désormais seront grandes quoi qu'on fasse, comparées à celles d'il y a trois ans, votre éducation militaire est faite, vous n'avez que trop bien répondu à ceux qui souriaient au récit de vos batailles de 1861, vous n'avez que trop vite appris à affronter la mort et à tuer, et ce que vous avez appris, vous ne le désapprendrez plus, vous ne retournerez pas à votre situation première.

Toutefois, sans espérer revoir vos effectifs militaires de dix mille hommes, nous espérons que les effectifs qui se comptent par centaines de mille ne figureront pas longtemps sur le sol américain.

III.

Courage ! vous avez devant vous une des œuvres les plus nobles, les plus belles, qui se puissent accomplir ici-bas, une œuvre au succès de laquelle nous sommes intéressés comme vous, une œuvre dont le succès sera l'honneur et la consolation de notre temps.

La génération actuelle n'aura rien vu de plus grand que l'abolition de l'esclavage (en le tuant chez vous, vous le tuez partout) et l'énergique relèvement d'un peuple qui, au milieu de ses prospérités croissantes, s'affaissait visiblement sous le poids des tyrannies du Sud, des complicités du Nord, des lois odieuses et des compromis.

Maintenant au prix d'immenses sacrifices vous avez réagi contre le mal ; vous avez mieux aimé donner votre sang et vos dollars que de descendre plus longtemps sur cette pente sans terme

où riches, unis, puissants, vous étiez en train de perdre ce qui est supérieur à la richesse, à l'union et à la puissance.

Eh bien ! ce que vous avez fait, l'Europe, bon gré mal gré, commence à le reconnaître. En France, en Angleterre, partout votre cause gagne du terrain. Et, disons le, à l'honneur du 19e siècle, l'obstacle que nos malveillances et nos passions n'ont pu franchir, l'obstacle que les intrigues du Sud n'ont pu surmonter, c'est une idée, un principe. La haine de l'esclavage a été votre champion dans l'ancien monde. Pauvre champion en apparence ! On en rit, on le baffoue, il semble bien faible et bien isolé, mais laissez faire, en fin de compte, les principes sont quelque chose, et dans nos affaires humaines la conscience a le dernier mot.

Voilà, Messieurs, ce que nous avions à vous dire, au nom de tous ceux qui, avec nous et mieux que nous, défendent votre cause en Europe. Vos paroles nous ont encouragés : puissent les nôtres vous encourager à leur tour. Vous aurez encore à traverser plus d'un sombre défilé ; plus d'une fois encore on vous démontrera l'impossibilité du succès ; plus d'une fois en présence d'un échec militaire, ou d'une difficulté politique, on s'écriera que tout est perdu. Que vous importe ? Rendez votre cause toujours plus forte en la rendant toujours plus juste, et ne craignez rien : Il y a un Dieu là-haut.

Nous aimons à contempler par l'espérance, le noble avenir qui semble vous attendre. Le jour où vous sortirez enfin des angoisses de la guerre civile, et vous en sortirez affranchis de l'institution odieuse qui corrompait vos mœurs publiques, et abattait votre politique au-dedans comme au-dehors, ce jour-là, votre pays entier, le Sud aussi bien que le Nord, et mieux que le Nord, peut-être, entrera en possession d'une prospérité toute nouvelle. L'émigration Européenne se hâtera vers vos ports, et apprendra le chemin de ceux où jàdis elle aurait craint d'aborder ; les cultures abandonnées se relèveront ; la liberté, ce sont ses miracles, vivifiera, en le touchant, le sol qu'avait stérilisé l'esclavage.

Alors naîtra pour vous une grandeur plus sûre et meilleure que l'ancienne, car elle ne coûtera rien à la justice.

Paris, le 31 Octobre, 1863.

AGÉNOR DE GASPARIN.

AUGUSTIN COCHIN.

EDOUARD LABOULAYE,
de l'Institut de France.

HENRI MARTIN.

LETTRE DE M. ERNEST CAYLUS.

Le Chambon, 29 Juillet, 1863.

Mon cher Monsieur,

Je voulais vous écrire pour vous aviser que j'avais remis à nos amis de Paris, l'adresse de la Ligue, et vous transmettre leurs remerciments. Il m'a été très agréable de remplir cette mission près de mon vieil ami Henri Martin, de Gasparin, mon ancien camarade de collège, de Laboulaye, dont le frère était mon ami à l'École Polytechnique, et de renouer ainsi de vieilles relations d'intimité et de sympathie ; j'ai eu aussi un bien vif plaisir à faire la connaissance de M. Cochin, mais en présence des nouvelles que je reçois je ne m'étends pas sur ce sujet.

Ces nouvelles sont toutes très bonnes. D'abord, les avis du théâtre de la guerre, et ensuite, ceux de l'émeute à New York. Sans contredit, cette émeute est bien affligeante, et elle m'a inspiré, outre les appréhensions politiques, de graves inquiétudes au sujet des amis si chers que j'ai à New York. Mais j'espère qu'elle aura pour effet d'ouvrir les yeux aux hommes honnêtes. On m'a beaucoup traité de visionnaire et de calomniateur du parti démocratique pendant tout l'hiver dernier. Je n'ai cessé de dire qu'il y avait une conspiration organisée à New York, avec des ramifications dans les autres États : je sentais cette conspiration au langage et à la conduite de beaucoup d'hommes qui, voyant que leur ancienne influence politique allait à la dérive, voulaient la reconquérir au prix même d'un crime.

Si notre armée eût été battue, peut-être s'en était fini de la République. J'espère que vous aurez profité de cette effroyable émeute pour anéantir la puissance diabolique des méchants citoyens, qui, plus que les armées du Sud, ont retardé le triomphe de nos armes. Je regrette bien d'avoir été absent de New York, et de n'avoir pu unir mes faibles efforts à ceux que vous avez tous faits pour soumettre les insurgés et j'espère pour les *punir*, ou, du moins, pour punir les meneurs.

Veuillez présenter mes respectueux souvenirs à M. votre père, et me rappeler au souvenir de nos amis, et recevoir mes amicales salutations.

E. Caylus.

Mr. John Austin Stevens, Jr.,
N. Y.

REPLY

OF

MESSRS. AGENOR DE GASPARIN, EDOUARD LABOULAYE, HENRI MARTIN, AUGUSTIN COCHIN,

TO THE

Loyal National League of New York,

TOGETHER WITH

THE ADDRESS OF THE LEAGUE,

ADOPTED AT THE

MASS INAUGURAL MEETING,

In Union Square, April 11, 1863.

NEW YORK:
WM. C. BRYANT & CO., PRINTERS, 41 NASSAU ST., COR. LIBERTY.

1864.

REPLY

OF

MESSRS. AGENOR DE GASPARIN, EDOUARD LABOULAYE, HENRI MARTIN, AUGUSTIN COCHIN,

TO

THE LETTER OF THE LOYAL NATIONAL LEAGUE.

TRANSLATED BY JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS, JR.

GENTLEMEN,—We would have thanked you much sooner but for the prolonged absence of one of our number. It would have been painful to us to have lost the collective character of this reply; for the blending of our four names is a proof of that great unity of sentiment upon all that concerns the cause of justice which by God's favor manifests itself here below, in spite of political and religious differences.

Yet we are careful not to overrate our personal importance. The League does not address us as individuals; it speaks to France, who cherishes, as a national tradition, the friendship of the United States. It speaks to European opinion, which will rise up and declare itself more clearly as it recognizes that the struggle is between Slavery and Liberty.

You have comprehended, gentlemen, that neither France nor Europe have been free from misapprehensions. Light did not at first dawn upon the nature of the salutary but painful crisis through which you are passing; it was not plain to all, at the outset, that the work inaugurated by the election of Mr. LINCOLN yielded

nothing in grandeur to that which your fathers accomplished with the aid of La Fayette and under the guidance of Washington.

Europe has had her errors, her hesitations, for which we are paying dearly to-day on both shores of the Atlantic. What blood would have been spared to you, what industrial suffering avoided by us, had European opinion declared itself with that force which you had the right to hope for! There is a protest of the universal conscience before which mankind necessarily recoils; moral forces are, after all, the great forces.

The revolted South, which needed our aid, which relied, and perhaps still relies upon us, would not have long dared to affront the indignation of the civilized world.

I.

Why has this indignation been withheld? Why has a sort of favor been granted to the only insurrection which has had neither motive nor pretext—to the only one which has dared to unfurl the banner of slavery? What has been the merit of this insurrection? By what charm has it conciliated the sympathy of more than one enlightened mind? This is a question humiliating to put, but useful to solve.

In the first place, Europe doubted whether slavery was the real cause of conflict. Strange doubt, in truth! For many years slavery had been the great, the only subject of strife in the United States. At the time of the election of Mr. Buchanan the only issue was slavery. The electoral platforms prove this fact; the manifestos of the South were unanimous in this sense; her party leaders, her governors, her deliberative assemblies, her press, spoke but of slavery; the Vice-President of the insurgent Confederacy had made haste to declare officially that the mission of the new State was to present to the

admiration of mankind a society founded on the "*corner-stone*" of slavery. Lastly, it would seem that to all reflecting minds the acts of Mr. Buchanan and other Presidents named by the South were proof enough of this truth. The South thinks only of slavery. In her eyes all means are right to secure to slavery its triumphs and boundless conquests.

But, it is objected that Mr. Lincoln and his friends were not abolitionists. That is certain; their programme went no further than to stop the extension of slavery, and shut it out from the territories. Was this nothing? Was it not, in fact, every thing? Who could have foreseen that, on the appearance of such a programme, of a progress so unexpected, of an attack so bold upon the policy which was lowering and ruining the United States, the friends of liberty would not all have hastened to applaud? Was not this the time to cheer and strengthen those who were thus entering on the good path? Was it not due to urge them on in their liberal tendencies, so that, the first step taken, they should take the second, and go on to the end? Ought not that which terrified and dismayed the champions of slavery to rejoice the hearts of its adversaries?

Your letter, gentlemen, puts in bold relief the reasons which hindered Mr. Lincoln from adopting at the outset an abolition policy. The President could disregard neither his oath of office nor the Federal Constitution; he had also to keep in mind the opposition which a plan of emancipation would encounter in the loyal States. The head of a great government cannot act with the freedom of a philosopher in his study. In simple truth, Mr. Lincoln should be accused neither of timidity nor indifference. Your letter recalls the measures of his presidency, abolition of slavery in the capital and in the District of Columbia, the proclaiming of freedom to fugitive slaves, the principle of compensated emancipation submitted to all the loyal States, the death penalty actually inflicted on captains of slavers, the treaty with

England admitting the right of search, the establishment of diplomatic relations with the black Republics of Liberia and Hayti, the arming of free negroes, and at last, when the length and gravity of the war sanctioned an extreme exercise of the powers of commander-in-chief, the absolute and final suppression of slavery in all the revolted States.

We, gentlemen, are abolitionists; and we declare that we have never hoped nor wished for a more steady, rapid, and resolute progress. We have understood the difficulties which surrounded Mr. LINCOLN. We have honored his scruples of conscience with regard to the Constitution of his country, which stopped his path. We have admired the courageous good sense with which he moved straight on, the instant he could so do without danger to his cause or violation of the law.

Wonder is expressed that slavery is abolished in the revolted States, and yet preserved in the loyal States! In other words, there is wonder that he who has sworn to obey the Constitution should respect it. Let no one take alarm at this. There is no danger that the "*domestic institution*" crushed in the Carolinas and Louisiana will long survive in Kentucky or Maryland. Already, as you have stated to us, a solemn proposition has been made to all the loyal States; already one of the most important, Missouri, has set the example of acceptance. To be thus uneasy about the maintenance of slavery in the North argues to our minds quite too much tenderness for the South. We look with suspicion upon this pretended abolitionism whose unfriendly exactions were first put forth on the very day illumined in America by the dawn of abolition. We frankly say we could never have foreseen that the election of Mr. LINCOLN, and the several acts which we have just enumerated, would be an endless cause of complaint and distrust and unworthy denunciation from so many men who plume themselves in Europe upon their hatred of slavery.

And since to destroy the North in public opinion it was not enough to accuse it of too much favor for slavery, another grievance has been found. The North oppressed the South! The struggle was of two nationalities! The South had risen for independence!

Its independence! There were, then, subject provinces in the heart of the Union? Doubtless these provinces had no part in the government of the country—the South had not the same rights as the North? Of course the South was held in this state of inferiority and subjection by numerous Federal garrisons? Not at all. All the States enjoyed the same rights, took like part in elections. If any section was favored, it was the South, to which a further suffrage was granted in proportion to the number of its slaves. If any advantage had been enjoyed, it was by the South, which had given the majority of Presidents and chief officers. Yet in this free country—a country without an army, and whose material means as well as laws were a sufficient barrier against oppression—in such a country we are told of a province claiming independenee!

We are of your opinion, gentlemen, that *independence* and *nationality* are words too noble to be abused. In their abuse, things are compromised, and the more noble and sacred these things, the more careful should we be not to confound them with what is neither noble nor sacred—a revolt in the name of slavery, a fratricidal revolt which would destroy a free Constitution, and tear asunder a common country, for fear lest there might be interference with the internal slave traffic, the continued breeding in Virginia, the sale and separation of families, and lest perchance some territories should be shut out from the conquests of slavery.

In vain we seek in the United States for a nationality striving to regain its independence. Not only has independence been nowhere assailed, but there is absolutely no trace of a separate

nationality. Nowhere, perhaps, is there a more thorough national homogeneity. North and South the race is the same; faith, language, history, and, we boldly add, interests are all the same. All these States have struggled together, suffered together, triumphed together. Their glories, their defeats, are common. Their Constitution sprung from the free consent of all; all pledged themselves alike to remain faithful to its obligations.

This pledge is no empty word with which caprice may idly sport. Among the inventions of our epoch, there is none more extraordinary than the *right of secession*. Those who discovered it will no doubt teach us where it should stop. If each section has a right of secession from the country as a whole, why not each state a right of secession from such section? Why not each county a right of secession from the State? Why not each town a right of secession from the county? Why not each citizen a right of secession from the town?

The truth is, that, but for slavery, the South would not talk of its suppressed independence, nor of the right of secession. Slavery has brought the two sections to strife. The extinction of slavery will restore Unity. The North and the South will some day wonder that they could have failed to appreciate the most complete and homogeneous of nationalities.

A last resort remains. That we here may not see the great struggle on the subject of slavery, an attempt is made to present the struggle as one for domination.

But this latter struggle is the very life of free countries. It is not surprising that the North and the South each strove actively, energetically, noisily, for the triumph of their candidate and policy. But when one of them, losing the battle of the ballot, plunges without hesitation into another kind of battle; when it resists, arms in hand, the result of a regular election; when on the very day that it ceases to rule it tears into fragments the

common country, it is guilty of a crime for which it is difficult to imagine an excuse.

II.

You will crush the revolt, gentlemen. You will succeed—such is our belief—in re-establishing the Union. It will emerge from the bloody trial stronger, more free, more worthy of the noble destiny to which God summons it.

It has been *demonstrated* to us, it is true, that the re-establishment of the Union was impossible; but was it not also *demonstrated* to us, and by irrefutable argument, that you would be always, and of necessity, defeated; that you would never know how to handle a musket; that recruiting would become impracticable; that your finances would be exhausted; that your loans would not be taken; that you would become bankrupt; that riots would ravage your cities; that your Government would be overthrown. You have given to all these oracles the simplest and best answer. You will reply in the same manner to those who assert that the re-establishment of the Union is impossible.

What seems really impossible is *not* to restore the Union. Where draw the line between North and South? How maintain between them a state of peace, or even of truce? How shall Slavery and Liberty live side by side? How, moreover, restrain the South from European protectorates, and by what means arrest the frightful consequences of such protectorates? Geographically, morally, politically, separation would create an unnatural situation, a situation violent and hazardous, where each would live, arms in hand, waiting for the hour of conflict.

We have full faith, gentlemen, that such a trial will be spared to you. It is not that we overlook the difficulties which still remain for you to overcome; they are great—greater perhaps than we imagine. War has its vicissitudes, and you may per

haps be yet called upon to pass through periods of ill-fortune. Yet, one fact always remains, and shows on which side the final triumph will be found, supposing that there be no foreign intervention. The flag of the Union has now, for two years, never paused in its advance. It floats to-day over the soil of every revolted State without exception. The South has had its victories; it has never gained an inch of ground. The North has had its defeats; it has never fallen back. Master to-day of the entire course of the Mississippi, master of the Border States and of Louisiana, all that remains is to stifle the revolt in the narrow territory where it first burst forth and back to which it has been driven. We believe that you will succeed in this; for Europe, the only hope of the South, seems now little disposed to give her aid.

In short, the rebellion is already reduced to such narrow proportions, that should it ever become a distinct confederation, accepted as such from weariness of war, the confederacy thus created will not be born with the functions of life. Neither European recognition nor your own could give it a serious chance of duration. It would end in a return to you. But we delight to believe the re-establishment of the Union less distant. And in the presence of that prospect which thrills our hearts with joy, permit us, us your friends, to offer you some sincere advice. The dangers of victory, you are aware, are not less than those of the combat. We give you, therefore, our loyal, frank opinion, sure that in the main it will agree with your own, and feeling, also, that these communications between us have an aim more serious than a simple exchange of words of sympathy.

We hold it to be of the first importance that the cause of the war shall not survive the war; that your real foe, slavery, shall not remain upon the field. We have often asked ourselves, these last three years, why God permitted the prolongation of this

bloody struggle. Was it not that the real issue might present itself with perfect clearness? Conquering earlier, the Federal Government would, perhaps, have been led to make concessions, to enter anew upon the fatal path of compromise. To-day all eyes, not willingly blind, see clearly. The New York riot, breaking out at an appointed day to aid the invasion of Lee, and falling instantly upon the negro in a way to show to every witness of its cowardly ferocity what kind of spirit animated certain friends of the South—the New York riot was a supreme warning to your country. Your line of action is clearly traced. So long as anything of slavery remain, there will be a cause of antagonism in the bosom of the Union. There must be no longer any question of slavery. It must be so ordered and settled as never to return. An *amendment to the Constitution* to this end must be proposed and adopted before the return of the States.

The condition of the free blacks must also be secured against the iniquities which they have so long endured. No more plans of colonization abroad, no more disabling laws, no more inequality. Those whom you have armed, who fought so bravely before the walls of Port Hudson and Fort Wagner, can never be other than citizens. Leave the problem of the races to its own solution—the most natural solutions are always the best. Under the rule of the common law, the free blacks of the South and of the North will find their legitimate place in your society, of which they will become useful members, honorable and honored.

In thus ordering in a definitive manner all that relates to slavery and the colored race you will have done more than is generally imagined for the lasting pacification of the South. What remains for you to do on this point may be stated in three words—*Moderation*, *Generosity*, *Liberty*.

There can be no question, as you have often said, of an occu-

pation of the South, of a conquest of the South, of reducing the Southern States to the condition of provinces where the conqueror will maintain his garrisons and the public life will be suspended. Save in the districts yet ravaged by guerillas and in the heart of which the Federal troops must finish their work, victory will everywhere bring with the re-establishment of the Union the re-establishment as promptly as possible of Constitutional rights. You hope, gentlemen, that those whom you conquer to-day will to-morrow meet you in debate, and you will accept in all their truth the struggle of the press, of the legislative hall, and of the ballot which will replace the strife of the battle-field.

We all feel it is much better that you should have to encounter difficulties fruitful of liberty, than that you should seek for yourselves the deceitful advantages of a dictatorial regime. To apply to the South an exceptional rule would be, alas, quite easy. It would be easy also to pronounce the death penalty, to outlaw, to execute confiscation bills; but in treading this path of vulgar tyranny you would sacrifice two things—your high renown in the present, a lasting Union with the South in the future.

But if, on the other hand, you show the world the novel spectacle of victory without reprisals, of liberty strong enough to survive civil war; if your Constitution remain, and slavery alone fall in such a conflict; if on the morrow of the struggle the law remain supreme, if elections for the Senate and House of Representatives be again open as in the old time, if the representatives of the Southern States reappear at Washington; if, taking the oath to be faithful to the Union and to support the modified Constitution, they find themselves on a footing of perfect equality with the representatives of the North; if it is permitted to them to attack and to embarrass the Government,—you will have won the most glorious of victories, and as-

sured to your country the best chance of prosperity and greatness.

Accept, gentlemen, in the advice which we tender to you, a proof of our esteem. It is not of every government, it is not of every people, that such things can be asked. Protracted civil wars tend to arbitrary customs, stir up passions and hates, and at last engender a development of military power and irresponsible authority which generally hinders a return to control, to free opinion, and to the strict letter of the law. We honor the United States enough to believe that they will be capable of setting us this too, after so many other examples.

The moderation which we hope for from you at home, we look for also from you abroad. Assuredly on the morrow of the submission of the South there will not be wanting a class of persons eager to recall to you wrongs, real or fancied, suffered at the hands of this or that power. They will point to your armies and disposable fleets. They will prove to you that a foreign war is perhaps the surest way to draw together the two sections so lately hostile. They will tell you that a common enmity, common dangers, are the cement needed to strengthen your shattered edifice.

You will not believe them, gentlemen. You will feel that after these jars it is needful before all else to restore to America peace and liberty. You will not seek new adventures and thus lengthen the temptation of dictatorships, the peril of exceptional rule.

You will fear a return to the aggressive policy which, with its invasions and turbulence, the influence of the South forced upon you, the day when, to assure the extension of slavery, it awakened in your hearts a wicked covetousness, and pushed you almost to the violation of the law of nations. Your glory will be to take the opposite of those violent declarations, of those fillibustering expeditions, of those unscrupulous ambitions.

The temptations which a great army excites are of the class most difficult to repress. May you not hesitate to reduce your forces after peace! Not only your material prosperity but your very liberty is involved in disarming, in a reduction of your expenses, and a return to the old idea of small armies and small budgets.

But we do not deceive ourselves. Your small armies, do what you may, will be large compared with those of three years ago. Your military education is completed; you have replied but too well to those who smiled at the recital of your battles of 1861. You have learned but too quickly to face death and to kill, and what you have learned you will not unlearn. You will not return to your former situation.

But while we do not expect again to see your effective force at ten thousand men, we do hope that effective forces which are now numbered by hundreds of thousands will not long be witnessed on American soil.

III.

Courage! You have before you one of the most noble works, the most sublime which can be accomplished here below—a work in the success of which we are as interested as yourselves—a work the success of which will be the honor and the consolation of our time.

This generation will have seen nothing more grand than the abolition of slavery (in destroying it with you, you destroy it everywhere), and the energetic uprising of a people which, in the midst of its growing prosperity, was visibly sinking under the weight of the tyranny of the South, the complicity of the North, odious laws and compromises.

Now, at the cost of immense sacrifices, you have stood up against the evil; you have chosen rather to pour out your blood

and your dollars than to descend further the slope of degradation where, rich, united, powerful, you were sure to lose that which is far nobler than wealth, or union, or power.

Well! Europe begins to understand, willingly or unwillingly, what you have done. In France, in England, everywhere, your cause gains ground, and be it said for the honor of the nineteenth century, the obstacle which our ill-will and our evil passions could not overcome, the obstacle which the intrigues of the South could not surmount, is an idea, a principle. Hatred of slavery has been your champion in the Old World. A poor champion seemingly. Laughed at, scorned, it seems weak and lonely. But what matters it? Ere the account be closed, principles will stand for something, and conscience, in all human affairs, will have the last word.

This, gentlemen, is what we would say to you in the name of all who, with us, and better than ourselves, defend your cause in Europe. Your words have cheered us; may ours, in turn, cheer you! You have yet to cross many a dark valley. More than once the impossibility of success will be demonstrated to you; more than once, in the face of some military check or political difficulty, the cry will be raised that all is lost. What matters it to you? Strengthen your cause daily by daily making it more just, and fear not: there is a God above.

We love to contemplate in hope the noble future which seems to stretch itself before you. The day you emerge at last from the anguish of civil war—and you will surely come out freed from the odious institution which corrupted your public manners, and degraded your domestic as well as your foreign policy—that day your whole country, South as well as North, and the South perhaps more fully than the North, will enter upon a wholly new prosperity. European emigration will hasten toward your ports, and will learn the road to those whom until now it has feared to approach. Cultivation, now abandoned,

will renew its yield. Liberty—for these are her miracles—will revivify by her touch the soil which slavery had rendered barren.

Then there will be born unto you a greatness nobler and more stable than the old, for in this greatness there will be no sacrifice of justice.

AGENOR DE GASPARIN.
AUGUSTIN COCHIN.
EDOUARD LABOULAYE,
Member of the Institute of France.
HENRI MARTIN.

Paris, October 31, 1863.

LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY,

863 BROADWAY.

No. 43.

Antwort der Herren

Agenor de Gasparin, Edouard Laboulaye, Henri Martin, Auguſtin Cochin und anderer Freunde Amerikas in Frankreich

an die

LOYAL NATIONAL LEAGUE

zu New-York.

Meine Herren:—Ohne die verlängerte Abweſenheit Eines von uns würden wir Ihnen viel früher unſern Dank ausgeſprochen haben. Mit Bedauern hätten wir unſere Erwiederung ihres Collektiv-Charakters beraubt geſehen; denn die Vereinigung unſerer vier Namen iſt ein Beweis jener großen Einheit der Geſinnung in Bezug auf Alles, was die Sache der Gerechtigkeit betrifft, welche ſich durch Gottes Gnade hier auf Erden trotz der Verſchiedenheit politiſcher und religiöſer Anſichten ausſpricht.

Aber wir werden uns hüten, unſere perſönliche Bedeutung zu überſchätzen. Die League wendet ſich nicht an uns als Individuen; ſie ſpricht zu Frankreich, das die Freundſchaft der Vereinigten Staaten als eine nationale Ueberlieferung werth hält. Sie ſpricht zu der öffentlichen Meinung Europas, welche ſich in dem Maße beſtimmter erheben und ausſprechen wird, als ſie erkennt, daß es ſich um einen Kampf zwiſchen der Sklaverei und der Freiheit handelt. Sie, meine Herren, haben begriffen, daß weder Frankreich noch Europa frei von Mißverſtändniſſen war. Die Natur der heilſamen aber peinlichen Criſis, welche Sie durchzumachen haben, erſchien nicht ſo gleich in ihrem wahren Lichte; im Beginne war es nicht Allen klar, daß das durch Herrn Lincoln's Wahl begonnene Werk an Größe dem nicht nachſtand, das Ihre Väter mit Lafayette's Hülfe und unter Waſhington's Leitung vollendeten.

Europa beging Irrthümer und lag in Unſchlüſſigkeit, was wir jetzt auf den beiden Ufern des Atlantiſchen Oceans theuer bezahlen. Wie viel Blut

würde Ihnen erspart, wie viel industrielles Leiden von uns abgewendet worden sein, hätte sich die öffentliche Meinung mit jener Macht ausgesprochen, welche Sie zu hoffen berechtigt waren! Vor dem Protest des Universal-Gewissens schrickt nothwendigerweise die Menschheit zurück; die moralische Macht ist immer die große Macht.

Der rebellische Süden, der unserer Hülfe bedurfte, der sich auf uns verließ und es vielleicht noch thut, würde nicht lange gewagt haben, der Entrüstung der civilisirten Welt Trotz zu bieten.

I.

Warum aber wurde diese Entrüstung vorenthalten? Warum begünstigte man einigermaßen die einzige Insurrektion, welche weder einen Grund noch einen Vorwand hatte,—die einzige, welche es wagte, das Banner der Sklaverei zu entfalten? Was war das Verdienst dieser Insurrektion? Durch welchen Zauber hat dieselbe sich der Sympathie so mancher aufgeklärten Geister bemächtigt?

Es ist demüthigend, diese Frage zu stellen, aber nützlich sie zu beantworten.

Zuerst zweifelte Europa, ob die Sklaverei die wirkliche Ursache des Streites sei. Wahrlich! ein sonderbarer Zweifel! Während vieler Jahre war die Sklaverei der einzige Gegenstand des Kampfes in den Ver. Staaten gewesen. Zur Zeit der Wahl des Hrn. Buchanan war die Sklaverei der einzige Streitpunkt. Die Wahlplatformen beweisen diese Thatsache; die Manifeste des Südens waren in dieser Beziehung einig; seine Parteiführer, seine Gouverneure, seine berathenden Versammlungen, seine Presse sprachen nur von der Sklaverei; der Vice-Präsident der rebellischen Conföderation hatte sich beeilt, officiell zu erklären, daß es die Mission des neuen Staates sei, der Bewunderung der Menschheit eine Gesellschaft darzubieten, welche die Sklaverei zum „Grundstein" habe. Dann sollte auch schließlich allen denkenden Geistern Hr. Buchanan und alle andern vom Süden ernannten Präsidenten Beweis genug für diese Wahrheit sein. Der Süden hält alle Mittel für rechtmäßig, welche der Sklaverei Triumphe und unbegrenzte Eroberungen zusichern können.

Aber, wendet man ein, Hr. Lincoln und seine Freunde waren keine Abolitionisten. Das ist wahr: deren Programme verlangten nicht mehr, als daß der Ausdehnung der Sklaverei Einhalt gethan und dieselbe von den Territorien ferngehalten werde. War das Nichts? War das nicht in der That Alles? Wer konnte voraussehen, daß die Freunde der Freiheit sich nicht beeilen würden, dem Erscheinen eines solchen Programmes, einem so unerwarteten Fortschritte, einem so kühnen Angriffe auf die Politik, durch welche die Vereinigten Staaten herabgewürdigt und zu Grunde gerichtet wurden, ihren Beifall zu spenden? War es nicht an der Zeit, die

Männer aufzumuntern und zu stärken, welche die gute Bahn betraten? War es nicht Pflicht, sie in ihren freisinnigen Bestrebungen anzuspornen, damit sie nach dem ersten Schritt auch den zweiten thun und bis zum Ziele fortschreiten möchten? Sollte das, was die Anhänger der Sklaverei erschreckte und bestürzte, nicht die Herzen der Feinde derselben erfreut haben?

Ihr Brief, meine Herren, hebt schlagend die Gründe hervor, welche Hrn. Lincoln verhinderten, im Beginne seiner Verwaltung die Abolitionspolitik anzunehmen. Der Präsident konnte weder seinen Amtseid noch die Bundesverfassung außer Augen lassen; er durfte auch die Opposition nicht unberücksichtigt lassen, auf welche ein Emancipationsplan in den loyalen Staaten gestoßen wäre. Das Haupt einer großen Regierung kann nicht mit der Freiheit eines Philosophen in dem Studierzimmer handeln. In Wahrheit sollte Hr. Lincoln weder der Furchtsamkeit noch der Gleichgültigkeit angeklagt werden. Ihr Brief erinnert an die Maßregeln seiner Präsidentschaft, an die Abolition der Sklaverei in der Hauptstadt und in dem Distrikt Columbia, an die Proklamation der Freiheit für flüchtige Sklaven, an das allen loyalen Staaten vorzuschlagende Prinzip der Emancipation mit Entschädigung der Sklavenhalter; an die Todesstrafe vollstreckt gegen Capitäne von Sklavenhandel treibenden Schiffen; an den mit England abgeschlossenen Vertrag, der das Durchsuchungsrecht anerkennt; an die Anknüpfung des diplomatischen Verkehrs mit den schwarzen Republiken Liberia und Hayti; an die Bewaffnung freier Neger und endlich an die unbedingte und endgültige Abschaffung der Sklaverei in allen Rebellenstaaten, als die Dauer und die Schwere des Krieges die äußerste Anwendung der Gewalt des Oberbefehlshabers sanktionirte.

Wir, meine Herren, sind Abolitionisten, und wir erklären, daß wir nie einen sicherern, schnellern und entschlossenern Fortschritt hofften noch wünschten. Wir begriffen die Schwierigkeiten, von denen Lincoln umgeben war. Wir achteten die constitutionellen Gewissensscrupel, welche ihn auf seiner Bahn aufhielten. Wir bewunderten den muthigen, gesunden Sinn, mit dem er gerade aus weiterschritt, so bald es ihm ohne Gefahr für seine Sache, ohne Verletzung des Gesetzes möglich war.

Man wundert sich darüber, daß die Sklaverei in den Rebellenstaaten abgeschafft und dennoch in den loyalen Staaten erhalten wurde! Mit andern Worten, man wundert sich, daß der Mann, welcher der Verfassung Gehorsam geschworen, dieselbe achtet.

Beunruhigen wir uns nicht darüber. Es ist keine Gefahr vorhanden, daß die „häusliche Institution“ ihre Vernichtung in Carolina und Louisiana lange in Kentucky und Maryland überleben werde. Bereits ist, wie Sie uns berichtet haben, allen loyalen Staaten ein feierlicher Vorschlag in dieser Beziehung gemacht worden; bereits hat Missouri, einer der bedeutend-

sten derselben, das Beispiel der Annahme gegeben. Solche Besorgniß in Bezug auf die Erhaltung der Sklaverei in dem Norden dünkt uns ein Zeichen zu großer Zärtlichkeit für den Süden zu sein. Wir blicken mit Mißtrauen auf diesen angeblichen Abolitionismus, dessen unfreundliche Forderungen erst an dem Tage sich geltend machten, an dem in Amerika das Morgenroth der Abolition anbrach. Wir sprechen es offen aus, nie hätten wir voraussehen können, daß die Erwählung des Hrn. Lincoln und die verschiedenen soeben angeführten Akte Ursachen endloser Klagen, des Mißtrauens und unwürdiger Denunciationen von Seiten so vieler Männer hätten werden können, welche sich in Europa mit ihrem Hasse gegen die Sklaverei brüsten.

Und da es, um den Norden in der öffentlichen Meinung zu Grunde zu richten, nicht genügte, denselben anzuklagen, der Sklaverei zu günstig zu sein, fand man eine andere Beschwerde aus. Der Norden unterdrückte den Süden! Es handelt sich um einen Kampf zwischen zwei verschiedenen Nationalitäten! Der Süden hat sich zur Erlangung seiner Unabhängigkeit erhoben!

Für seine Unabhängigkeit! Es gab also in der Union unterjochte Provinzen? Ohne Zweifel hatten diese Provinzen keinen Antheil an der Regierung des Landes, der Süden genoß nicht derselben Rechte, wie der Norden? Der Süden war also durch zahlreiche Bundesgarnisonen niedergehalten und unterjocht! Durchaus nicht! Alle Staaten waren im Besitze gleicher Rechte, betheiligten sich gleichmäßig an den Wahlen. Gab es einen begünstigten Theil, so war es der Süden, der die Mehrheit der Präsidenten und der hohen Beamten gegeben hatte. Und doch spricht man von einer Provinz, welche ihre Unabhängigkeit verlangt in diesem freien Lande, in einem Lande ohne Armee, dessen materielle Mittel sowohl als Gesetze genügende Schranken gegen Unterdrückung sind.

Wir theilen Ihre Ansicht, meine Herren, und halten Unabhängigkeit und Nationalität für zu edle Worte für solchen Mißbrauch. Durch solchen Mißbrauch werden die Gegenstände selbst compromittirt und je edler und heiliger die Gegenstände sind, um so mehr müssen wir uns hüten, sie mit dem zusammen zu werfen, was weder edel noch erhaben ist,— mit einer im Namen der Sklaverei unternommenen Empörung, mit einer brudermörderischen Empörung, welche eine freie Verfassung vernichten und ein gemeinsames Vaterland zerreißen wollte, aus Furcht es möge eine Einmischung stattfinden in den einheimischen Sklavenhandel, in die fortgesetzte Sklavenzucht in Virginien, in den Verkauf und die Trennung von Familien, und aus Furcht, es könnten vielleicht einige Territorien gegen die Eroberung der Sklaverei verschlossen werden.

Vergebens suchen wir in den Ver. Staaten eine Nationalität im Kampfe

für die Wiedererlangung ihrer Unabhängigkeit. Nicht nur wurde eine Unabhängigkeit nirgends angegriffen, es ist nicht einmal die geringste Spur einer besondern Nationalität vorhanden. Nirgends anderswo vielleicht giebt es eine so vollständige nationale Homogenität. Dieselbe Race lebt im Norden wie im Süden; Religion, Sprache, Geschichte, und wir fügen ohne Bedenken hinzu, die Interessen sind überall dieselben. Alle diese Staaten haben vereint gekämpft, geduldet, triumphirt. Siege und Niederlagen sind ihnen gemeinsam. Ihre Constitution entsprang der freien Zustimmung Aller; alle verpflichteten sich gleichmäßig, deren Geboten gehorsam zu sein.

Diese Verpflichtung ist kein leeres Wort mit dem jede Laune ihr Spiel treiben kann. Unter den Erfindungen unserer Epoche gibt es keine außerordentlichere als die „des Rechtes der Secession." Die Erfinder werden uns ohne Zweifel erklären, wo dasselbe stehen bleiben soll. Wenn jede Section das Recht hat sich von dem Gesammtvaterlande zu trennen, warum sollte dann nicht jeder Staat gleichmäßig berechtigt sein sich von dieser Sektion loszureißen? Warum hätte nicht jedes County ein Recht sich vom Staate zu trennen? Warum hätte nicht jede Stadt ein Recht sich von dem County, —ein jeder Bürger das Recht von der Stadt sich loszusagen.

In Wahrheit würde der Süden ohne Sklaverei nicht von unterdrückter Unabhängigkeit, noch von dem Rechte der Secession sprechen.

Die Sklaverei hat den Streit zwischen den beiden Landestheilen hervorgerufen. Die Vernichtung der Sklaverei wird die Einheit wiederherstellen. Der Norden und der Süden werden sich dereinst wundern, daß sie aufhören konnten die vollständigste und homogenste aller Nationalitäten zu schätzen.

Noch ein anderer Vorwand wird vorgebracht. Damit wir in Europa nicht den großen Kampf über Sklaverei wahrnehmen sollen, versucht man denselben als einen Kampf für Herrschaft darzustellen.

Aber gerade dieser Kampf ist eine Bedingung des wahren Lebens freier Länder.

Es ist nicht erstaunlich, daß der Norden und der Süden mit gleicher Thätigkeit, Energie und Lebhaftigkeit für den Triumph ihrer Candidaten und ihrer Politik stritten.

Aber wenn einer derselben, geschlagen an der Wahlurne, sich ohne Bedenken in einen Kampf anderer Art stürzt; wenn er sich mit den Waffen in der Hand dem Ergebniß der regelmäßigen Wahl widersetzt, wenn er an dem Tage, an welchem er aufhört zu herrschen, das gemeinsame Vaterland zerreißt, macht er sich eines Verbrechens schuldig, für das es schwer wird, eine Entschuldignng zu erdenken.

II.

Sie werden, meine Herren, die Empörung zermalmen. Wir sind überzeugt, daß es Ihnen gelingen wird, die Union wieder herzustellen. Aus der blutigen Prüfung wird sie stärker, freier, würdiger erstehen der edeln Bestimmung, zu welcher sie Gott berufen hat.

Man hat uns allerdings zu beweisen gesucht, daß die Wiederherstellung der Union unmöglich sei; aber hat man uns nicht auch durch unwiderlegbare Gründe vordemonstrirt, daß Sie stets und nothwendigerweise geschlagen werden würden; daß Sie nie den Gebrauch des Gewehres lernen, daß Sie kein Heer aufbringen würden; daß Ihre Finanzen erschöpft, Ihre Anlehen nicht aufgenommen werden würden, daß Sie Bankerott machen müßten; daß Aufstände in Ihren Städten wüthen würden, daß Ihre Regierung gestürzt werden würde. Allen diesen Orakeln haben Sie die einfachste und beste Antwort gegeben. Sie werden ebenso denen antworten, welche behaupten, daß die Wiederherstellung der Union unmöglich sei.

Was in der That unmöglich scheint, ist, daß die Union nicht wiederhergestellt wird. Wo soll die Trennungslinie zwischen dem Norden und dem Süden gezogen werden? Wie kann zwischen beiden ein Friedenszustand, ja selbst nur ein Waffenstillstand erhalten werden? Wie sollen Sklaverei und Freiheit neben einander leben? Und wie kann man von dem Süden europäische Protektorate fern halten und mit welchen Mitteln die furchtbaren Folgen solcher Protektorate verhindern? Trennung würde geographisch, moralisch und politisch einen unnatürlichen Zustand erzeugen, einen gewaltsamen, unsichern Zustand, in dem Jeder mit den Waffen in der Hand und in der Erwartung der Stunde des neuen Kampfes leben würde.

Wir sind des festen Glaubens, meine Herren, daß Sie dieser Prüfung nicht unterworfen sein werden; nicht, daß wir die Schwierigkeiten übersähen, welche Sie noch zu überwinden haben; diese sind groß, größer vielleicht, als wir denken. Der Krieg ist voller Wechselfälle und vielleicht gehen Sie noch Perioden des Unglücks entgegen. Doch steht immer eine Thatsache fest, die zeigt, welche Seite zuletzt triumphiren wird, wenn keine fremde Intervention statt findet. Seit zwei Jahren wurde das Vorrücken des Unionsbanners nicht unterbrochen. Es weht nun auf dem Boden aller Rebellen-Staaten. Der Süden hat Siege errungen, aber nie einen Zoll Boden gewonnen. Der Norden hat Niederlagen erlitten, aber ist nie zurück gewichen. Jetzt Herr des ganzen Laufes des Mississippi, der Grenzstaaten und von Louisiana, bleibt ihm weiter zu thun Nichts übrig, als die Rebellion in dem engen Gebiete zu ersticken, von dem sie zuerst hervorbrach und auf das sie zurückgedrängt ist.

Wir glauben, es wird Ihnen das gelingen, denn Europa, die einzige

Hoffnung des Südens, scheint jetzt wenig geneigt zu sein, demselben Hülfe zu leisten.

Kurz, die Rebellion ist bereits auf so kleine Proportionen reduzirt, daß, sollte aus ihr eine getrennte Conföderation hervorgehen, anerkannt aus Ueberdruß am Kriege, eine so geschaffene Conföderation keine Lebensfähigkeit haben würde. Sie würde mit der Rückkehr zu Ihnen enden. Weder europäische noch Ihre eigene Anerkennung könnte ihr ernstliche Aussicht auf Dauer geben. Aber wir erfreuen uns in dem Glauben an eine baldigere Wiederherstellung der Union. Und mit dieser Aussicht, welche unser Herz mit Wonne erfüllt, erlauben Sie uns, Ihren Freunden, Ihnen einige aufrichtige Rathschläge zu geben. Die Gefahren des Sieges sind, wie Sie wohl wissen, nicht geringer, als die des Kampfes. Wir sprechen Ihnen daher unsere redliche, freimüthige Ansicht aus, überzeugt, daß dieselbe im Allgemeinen mit Ihrer eigenen übereinstimmen wird; auch fühlen wir, daß der Austausch unserer beiderseitigen Gesinnung einen höhern Zweck hat als den eines bloßen Austausches von Worten und Sympathien.

Wir halten es für besonders wichtig, daß die Ursache des Krieges den Krieg nicht überlebe, daß Ihr wirklicher Feind, die Sklaverei, nicht unvernichtet das Feld behaupte. Im Laufe der letzten drei Jahre haben wir oft gefragt, warum Gott die Fortdauer dieses blutigen Kampfes erlaube. Geschah es nicht etwa, damit der wahre Streitpunkt in voller Klarheit hervortrete? Rascher siegreich würde die Bundesregierung vielleicht verleitet worden sein, Zugeständnisse zu machen und von neuem die verderbliche Bahn des Compromisses zu betreten. Jetzt sind die Augen Aller, die nicht freiwillig blind sind, der Wahrheit geöffnet. Der New-Yorker Aufstand, der an einem festgesetzten Tage ausbrach um Lee's Einfall zu befördern und der augenblicklich über den Neger herstürzte, so daß er jedem Augenzeuge seiner feigen Grausamkeit den Geist zeigte, der die Freunde des Südens erfüllt, —dieser New-Yorker Aufstand war für das Land eine hohe Warnung. Der Weg, den Sie zu verfolgen haben, ist unverkennbar abgesteckt. So lange noch eine Spur der Sklaverei übrig ist, wird in dem Herzen der Union der Keim des Zwistes fortbestehen. Es darf keine Sklavenfrage mehr geben. Dieselbe muß so beantwortet und entschieden werden, daß an ein Zurückkommen auf dieselbe nie mehr zu denken ist. Zu diesem Zweck muß vor der Rückkehr der Staaten in die Union ein Amendement zu der Verfassung vorgeschlagen und angenommen werden.

Die Lage der freien Schwarzen muß ebenfalls gegen die von ihnen so lang erduldete Ungebühr gesichert werden. Man spreche nicht mehr von Colonisationsplänen, noch von Gesetzen, welche dieselben gewisser Rechte berauben und sie in einem Zustande der Ungleichheit erhalten. Die Männer, welche Sie bewaffnet haben, die so tapfer vor den Wällen von Port

Hudson und Fort Wagner kämpften, müssen unbedingt Bürger werden. Ueberlassen Sie das Problem der Racen seiner eignen Lösung—die natürlichsten Lösungen sind stets die besten. Unter der Herrschaft des gemeinsamen Gesetzes für Alle werden die freien Schwarzen des Südens und des Nordens ihre legitime Stellung in Ihrer Staatsgesellschaft finden, und nützliche, achtbare und geachtete Mitglieder derselben werden.

Durch eine solche definitive Anordnung alles dessen was sich auf die Sklaverei und die farbige Race bezieht, werden Sie für die Wiederherstellung eines dauernden Friedens im Süden mehr gethan haben, als man gewöhnlich glaubt. Was Ihnen in dieser Beziehung noch zu thun übrig bleibt, kann mit folgenden drei Worten ausgesprochen werden: Mäßigung, Großmuth, Freiheit.

Wie Sie oft gesagt haben, kann es sich nicht darum handeln, den Süden besetzt zu halten, um ihn zu erobern und zu Provinzen zu machen, in denen der Eroberer Garnisonen hält und das öffentliche Leben suspendirt. Mit Ausnahme der Distrikte, welche jetzt noch die Guerillabanden verheeren und in deren Innern die Unionstruppen ihr Werk zu vollenden haben, wird der Sieg überall die Wiederherstellung der Union, die möglichst schleunigste Wiedereinführung der konstitutionellen Rechte mit sich bringen.

Sie hoffen, meine Herren, daß diejenigen, welche sie heute besiegen, morgen mit Ihnen auf dem Boden der Debatte zusammen treffen werden und Sie nehmen in ganzer Wahrheit den Kampf in der Presse, in den Hallen der Legislatur und an der Wahlurne an, der an die Stelle des Kampfes auf dem Schlachtfelde treten wird.

Wir alle fühlen, daß es besser ist für Sie, Schwierigkeiten zu begegnen, welche der Freiheit Früchte bringen, als für Sie selbst die trügerischen Vortheile einer Diktatur zu suchen. Es würde leider nur zu leicht sein, den Süden einem Ausnahmssysteme zu unterwerfen. Es wäre auch leicht, Todesstrafe und Acht zu verkünden und Confiscationsgesetze auszuführen; aber begäben Sie sich auf diese Bahn der gewöhnlichen Tyrannei, so würden Sie zwei Dinge opfern: Ihren hohen Ruf in der Gegenwart und eine dauernde Union mit dem Süden für die Zukunft.

Geben Sie aber im Gegentheil der Welt das neue Schauspiel eines Sieges der Freiheit ohne Repressalien, stark genug, den Bürgerkrieg zu überleben; bleibt Ihre Verfassung aufrecht und fällt in diesem Kampfe nur die Sklaverei; tritt am Tage nach dem Streite das Gesetz wieder in seine volle Kraft; finden wieder, wie in der alten Zeit, Wahlen für den Senat und das Haus der Repräsentanten statt; erscheinen die Vertreter des Südens von Neuem in Washington, schwören sie, der Union treu zu sein und die verbesserte Verfassung zu vertheidigen und sind sie dann in Allem gleichberechtigt mit den Vertretern des Nordens, so daß es ihnen

selbst gestattet ist, die Regierung anzugreifen und ihr Verlegenheit zu bereiten, dann werden Sie den ruhmvollsten Sieg errungen und Ihrem Lande die beste Aussicht auf Wohlfahrt und Größe gegeben haben.

Empfangen Sie, meine Herren, diesen Rath als einen Beweis unserer Hochachtung. Nicht von jeder Regierung, nicht von jedem Volke kann Solches verlangt werden. Lange Bürgerkriege führen zu Gewohnheiten der Willkühr, entzünden Leidenschaft und Haß und erzeugen zuletzt eine um sich greifende Militärgewalt und unverantwortliche Autorität, welche gewöhnlich die Rückkehr zur Controlle, zur Freiheit der Meinungen und dem bestimmten Buchstaben des Gesetzes verhindern. Wir ehren die Ver. Staaten hoch genug, um sie für fähig zu halten, uns nach so vielen andern Beispielen auch dieses zu geben.

Die Mäßigung, welche wir von Ihnen gegen Innen hoffen, erwarten wir auch gegen Außen.

Gewiß wird es am Tage nach der Unterwerfung des Südens nicht an einer Klasse von Leuten fehlen, die Sie leidenschaftlich an das wirkliche oder scheinbare Unrecht erinnern werden, das Sie von dieser oder jener Macht zu erdulden hatten. Diese Leute werden auf Ihre Heere und Ihre Flotte hinweisen. Sie werden Ihnen beweisen, daß ein auswärtiger Krieg vielleicht das beste Mittel ist, die zwei kürzlich einander feindlichen Landestheile zusammenzubringen. Sie werden Ihnen sagen, daß gemeinsame Feindseligkeit, gemeinsame Gefahren die Elemente sind, deren es bedarf, um das beschädigte Staatsgebäude wieder zu kräftigen.

Sie werden ihnen nicht glauben. Sie werden, meine Herren, fühlen, daß nach diesen Kämpfen es vor Allem nöthig ist, Amerika Friede und Freiheit zurückzugeben. Sie werden sich nicht neuen Abenteuern entgegenstürzen und dadurch Diktaturgelüste und die Gefahr einer Willkührherrschaft hervorrufen.

Sie werden die Rückkehr der aggressiven Politik fürchten, welche zugleich mit deren Uebergriffen und gewaltsamem Gebaren der Süden Ihnen aufzwang in den Tagen, in denen der Versuch die Herrschaft der Sklaverei auszudehnen, in Ihren Herzen eine verbrecherische Ländergier entzündete und Sie beinahe bis zur Verletzung des Völkerrechts hinriß. Ihr Ruhm wird darin bestehen, den Gegensatz zu jenen heftigen Erklärungen, jenen Flibustier-Expeditionen, jenen gewissenlosen, ehrgeizigen Plänen darzubieten.

Die Gelüste, welche ein großes Heer erzeugt, sind am schwersten zu unterdrücken. Mögen Sie nicht zögern, nach dem Frieden Ihre Streitkräfte zu mindern. Nicht nur Ihre materielle Wohlfahrt, sondern Ihre Freiheit selbst hängt ab von der Entwaffnung, von der Verminderung Ihrer Aus-

gaben und von der Rückkehr zu der alten Idee kleiner Heere und kleiner Budgets.

Aber wir täuschen uns nicht, Ihre kleinen Heere, was Sie auch thun mögen, werden im Vergleich mit denen vor drei Jahren groß sein. Ihre militärische Erziehung ist vollendet. Sie haben nur zu gut denen geantwortet, welche Ihre Schlachten von 1861 belächelten. Sie haben nur zu schnell gelernt, dem Tode ins Angesicht zu sehen und zu tödten, und das Gelernte werden Sie nicht wieder vergessen. Sie werden nicht in Ihren früheren Zustand zurückkehren. Aber während wir nicht erwarten, Ihre effektive Armee wieder auf Zehntausend herabgesetzt zu sehen, hoffen wir, daß nicht lange Heere von Hunderttausenden auf dem amerikanischen Boden vorhanden sein werden.

III.

Muth! Vor Ihnen liegt eines der edelsten Werke, das Erhabenste, das hienieden ausgeführt werden kann, ein Werk in dessen Erfolg wir nicht weniger als Sie interessirt sind,—ein Werk, dessen Erfolg die Ehre und der Trost unseres Zeitalters sein wird.

Diese Generation wird nichts Größeres gesehen haben, als die Abschaffung der Sklaverei (denn indem Sie dieselbe bei Ihnen vernichten, vernichten Sie dieselbe überall) und die kräftige Erhebung eines Volkes, das mitten unter seinem wachsenden Wohlstande sichtbar dahinsank unter der Last der Tyrannei des Südens, der Mitschuld des Nordens, hassenswürdiger Gesetze und der Compromisse.

Nun haben Sie mit Darbringung ungeheurer Opfer sich gegen das Uebel erhoben; Sie haben vorgezogen, Ihr Blut und Ihre Dollars hinströmen zu lassen und wollten nicht tiefer am Abhange der Entwürdigung hinabgleiten, in der reich, vereint, mächtig, Sie sicher waren, das zu verlieren, was bei Weitem edler ist als Reichthum oder Einheit oder Macht.

Wohlan! Europa beginnt willig oder unwillig zu verstehen, was Sie vollbracht haben. In Frankreich, in England, überall gewinnt Ihre Sache Boden und zur Ehre des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts sei es gesagt, das Hinderniß, das Böswilligkeit und schlechte Leidenschaften nicht aus dem Wege räumen konnten, das Hinderniß, welches die Intriguen des Südens nicht bemeistern konnten, ist eine Idee, ein Prinzip. Der Haß gegen die Sklaverei war Ihr Verfechter in der alten Welt. Scheinbar ein schwacher Verfechter! Verlacht und verspottet schien er kraftlos und vereinsamt. Aber was thut das; ehe die Rechnung abgeschlossen ist, werden die Prinzipien etwas gelten und das Gewissen hat doch in allen menschlichen Angelegenheiten das letzte Wort.

Dies, meine Herren, wollten wir Ihnen im Namen aller derer sagen, die mit uns und besser als wir, in Europa Ihre Sache vertheidigen. Ihre Worte haben uns ermuthigt; mögen nun auch die unsrigen Sie ermuthigen! Noch manches finstere Thal haben Sie zu durchziehen. Noch mehr als einmal wird man Ihnen die Unmöglichkeit des Erfolges zu beweisen suchen; noch mehr als einmal wird bei einem Kriegsunfall oder einer politischen Schwierigkeit der Ruf erschallen: Alles ist verloren! Was kümmert Sie das? Kräftigen Sie täglich Ihre Sache, indem Sie dieselbe täglich gerechter machen, und haben Sie keine Furcht: Es waltet über uns ein Gott.

Sicher werden Sie aus der Qual des Bürgerkrieges hervorgehen, befreit von der verhaßten Institution, welche Ihre Nationalsitten verdarb und Ihre einheimische wie Ihre auswärtige Politik unwürdig machte. Dann wird Ihr ganzes Land, der Süden sowohl wie der Norden, und vielleicht der Süden mehr noch als der Norden, die Periode einer ganz neuen Wallfahrt beginnen. Von Europa wird die Einwanderung nach Ihren Häfen strömen und den Weg nach denen kennen lernen, welchen zu nahen sie bisher sich scheute. Der jetzt verlassene Ackerbau wird die Felder des Südens neu schaffen.

Die Freiheit—denn dies sind ihre Wunder—wird durch ihre Berührung den Boden wieder beleben, den die Sklaverei unfruchtbar gemacht hatte.

Dann wird Ihnen eine Größe zu Theil werden, edler, dauerhafter als die alte, denn in dieser Größe wird es keine Aufopferung der Gerechtigkeit geben.

Agenor de Gasparin.
Augustin Cochin.
Edouard Laboulaye,
Mitglied des Instituts von Frankreich.
Henri Martin.

Paris, den 31. Oktober 1863.

ADDRESS

OF THE

LOYAL NATIONAL LEAGUE

TO

MESSRS. AGENOR DE GASPARIN, EDOUARD LABOULAYE, AUGUSTIN COCHIN, HENRI MARTIN, AND OTHER FRIENDS OF AMERICA IN FRANCE.

BY JAMES McKAYE.

GENTLEMEN,—

The Loyal National League in the city of New York, an organization having its ramifications throughout all the loyal States, and bound together by the simple pledge "to maintain unimpaired the national unity both in idea and territorial boundary," have charged us with the grateful duty, in their name, to thank you for your disinterested and distinguished services in behalf of the American People and Union, in France.

Amidst the general misapprehension and bewilderment of the public opinion of Europe, you have clearly understood and appreciated the nature of the struggle in which the People and Government of the United States are involved, and your pertinent and impressive words have traversed the ocean and have inspired us with renewed hope and courage. In the heart of the American people, by the side of WASHINGTON, stands enshrined

forever that ancient form of French sympathy, generosity, and valor, the Marquis de La Fayette. He and his companions who stood by our fathers, in their great struggle against arbitrary power, in the popular imagination, have always represented France. Is it strange, then, that their children, treacherously assailed in the very citadel of their national life, by a far more pernicious and despotic power, should listen with reluctant ear to the voices that would persuade them that France had lost the clew of her own great career, and, repudiating the traditions of her own glory, conspired with such a power to overthrow freedom, the rights of human nature, and Christian civilization in America? The messages you have sent us, have cleared away the doubts that weighed upon our hearts, and proved to us, that notwithstanding the persistent efforts of the advocates of the slave power to conceal its deformities, and to misrepresent the true issues involved in its attack upon American nationality, the enlightened and liberal mind of France penetrates the whole mass of subterfuges, and sees clearly on which side lie truth and justice.

We esteem so much the more highly your enlightened and just appreciation of the cause for which we contend, inasmuch as we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that many things in the manner of conducting it, must seem anomalous to an European observer, unacquainted with the more intimate circumstances and principles peculiar to our American system and life.

The supreme necessity of a government founded in the will of the people, is to hold their public servants to the most exact and inexorable obedience to that will, as expressed in the written constitution—for that is the supreme law. To permit any assumption of power on the part of any one or all of these servants, under the pressure of any exigency, would be to open the door to endless ambitions and to incur the hazards of the most fatal consequences. Doubtless the founders of our national system of government intended, as far as possible, to ignore the

whole subject of slavery, to leave its interests entirely in the hands of the authorities of the several States in which it already existed, and to keep them wholly without the jurisdiction of the national constitution. For the sake of UNION they found it necessary to recognize it as an existing, but, as they believed, temporary *fact*, but never as a RIGHT; and so from the period of the adoption of the national constitution, the idea of the complete independence of slavery of the national government had been inculcated and strengthened. Its masters called it an *institution*, to put it upon a level with the fundamental law, the constitution itself. They moreover, at an early day, possessed themselves of its supreme judicial powers, and had thus in their own hands its interpretation. They proceeded to wrest its meaning to their own purposes, and to make of it an instrument for the perpetual maintenance of human bondage, instead of giving to it the true sense of its framers, a charter of liberty for all men. By allying themselves with a prevalent democracy at the North, they were able to instil and establish these interpretations, first in the popular mind of the whole country, and thence in much of the legislation of the national government. And if, with all this, you will bear in mind that the constitution, to the American citizen, stands in the place of the person of the sovereign, in the monarchical systems of Europe; that to it he owes paramount allegiance; that it is the supreme object of his loyalty, you will be the better able to understand the apparent hesitancy of the national government to strike at the existence of slavery, even in repelling its own blow at the life of the nation.

To destroy slavery, the acknowledged cause of the war, and at the same time to preserve intact the wise inhibitions of the constitution, according to the settled construction of that instrument, has been from the beginning a question of no little practical difficulty to the national administration. To carry on the war it must have the hearty support of the country. To be

sure of this support, it must not outrun pre-established public opinion. To enlighten and correct public opinion, time is necessary. Let us assure you that your own generous efforts to enlighten the public opinion of Europe have effected much to the same end here, and that the whole loyal country is fast coming up to the just and only solution of the great question in issue. The President's recent proclamation of emancipation is a proof; for, while it by no means completes the work, even in idea, it is at least a great step in the right direction. Issued under his constitutional powers as commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States, and as a measure of war, its direct operation must of necessity be restricted to such districts of country as still remain in unsubdued rebellion; but indirectly, and as a ground of *right* to freedom for the slave, its scope is much wider and more important. In any view of it, it surely deserves the hearty sympathy and support of all the enlightened lovers of liberty and progress, rather than such captious and unworthy criticisms as that of the English minister. Lord John Russell is the minister of a constitutional government; he cannot be ignorant what rights of war a commander-in-chief may exercise; he knows that the rights of war are restricted to the theatre of the war, and that under every constitutional government, power, in theory at least, is restricted to the exercise of rights.

We are glad to perceive, from a quite recent letter of your great historian and publicist, a name honored equally by the enlightened men of this country as of yours, that this act of our Chief Magistrate is clearly understood and appreciated in France. We are sure, also, that you do not misjudge our attachment to the forms of our institutions, for you understand that we value these forms, only, for the great principles and ideas of liberty and human justice which they embody, and because we believe them to constitute the surest guarantee for

the preservation and popular enjoyment of these principles and ideas.

Another ground of popular misapprehension, on your side of the Atlantic, as to the true issues at stake in our struggle, may very naturally have arisen out of the fact that in all the revolutionary movements of modern Europe, the insurgents have usually represented liberty, nationality, and progress, while the governments represented, if not arbitrary power, at best *authority* only, and the *status quo*. Here, on the contrary, exactly the reverse is true. Here the insurrection represents a power founded upon the utter annihilation of the commonest human rights—a boasted repudiation of all ideas of liberty and progress; while the national government, founded upon the principles of the Declaration of Independence of 1776, "the self-evident truths that all men are created equal, and are endowed by their Creator with the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," wars only to preserve the institutions in which these rights are embodied, and under which alone they can be maintained in the present exigency. But with all this, it is not difficult to see how the European mercenaries of the slave power, skillfully concealing the true character of its atrocious attempt to overthrow free government in America, and stealing the battle cry of the oppressed nationalities of the Old World—"National Independence"—should have been able to bewilder the public opinion, and draw to its shameless cause much of the sympathy of the popular heart of Europe, even of France.

Assuming, for the occasion, the part of the oppressed, these frenzied devastators of a whole race of men, have not hesitated to charge the loyal people of the North and the national government, with fighting only for dominion. "You fight," say they, "not for freedom, not for the emancipation of the enslaved, but only for the maintenance of power." The slightest examination will prove how unfounded and nefarious is this

charge. The whole controversy in the election of Mr. Lincoln turned upon the question of the limitation of the area of slavery. The Republican party, who made him their candidate and carried him into office, planted themselves upon the simple ground of limiting slavery to the lines within which it already existed. This attempt to resist the arrogant demand of the slave masters to appropriate to their own use the whole of the still unoccupied domain of the nation, constituted the whole offence of the People of the United States in that election. They simply said to them, the national domain and the national Government belong to us as well as you. Liberty is *our* heritage, and henceforth we mean that it shall have its rights in both government and domain.

No other ground of offence than this had the slave power for tearing asunder our national unity, no other excuse for the unparalleled crime of beginning the present war to destroy the national life. These facts are patent to the whole world. Who then is it, that is fighting for dominion?

We do not mean to say, that the diabolical exigencies of slavery do not necessitate the illimitable appropriation of territory and the unrestrained exercise of dominion which is demanded for it. Doubtless, like every other system of authority founded in mere power without right, slavery requires that its masters should be masters also of the law-making power of the government under which it exists.

Let the friends of the slave power in Europe have the benefit of the admission, that the exigencies of a slave society demand for its maintenance universal dominion, and the ultimate invasion of all the territories, that may at any given period lie adjacent to its boundaries. Thence not only all the territories of the Union, but when these should be absorbed, all Mexico and the South American States. Its inevitable instincts have already made themselves manifest in the various predatory expeditions, that from time to time have been set on foot at the South.

These were but a kind of offshoot of its exuberant and monstrous vitality; but they serve to illustrate the nature of the slave power.

In stripping from it the veil of sophistries with which it has sought to conceal its enormities, you have not only rendered a great service to our national cause, but to the cause of public justice and Christian civilization everywhere. For the cause of the Union is the cause of humanity, unless it is to be taken for granted that the public morality of Christendom requires that the United States should abdicate the character of a nation in the interests of the power which assails it. If the true nature of this power could be clearly presented to the public conscience of France, we should fearlessly rest ourselves upon its verdict. As it is, we cannot so much blame the general misapprehension, which has caused it not only to be tolerated, but to be clothed with a certain popular esteem, as well as with certain public rights, by the peoples and authorities of Europe, when we remember that even here, in the more immediate arena of its crimes, the peculiar character of American slavery has not hitherto been thoroughly apprehended by the popular mind.

Simple slavery is not a modern form of inhumanity. The annals of our race are full of the groans of the enslaved. But hitherto slavery has founded itself upon power—has rested its claim in the might of the strongest—has been content to enjoy its profits in the category of things without remedy. In no age of human history until now, has it ever been attempted to clothe slavery with the Sacredness of Right. The distinguished infamy belongs to the founders of the Southern confederacy, of setting up a government, whose corner stone, to use the language of one of the most notorious of them, Alex. H. Stephens, is "the right of the superior race to enslave the inferior." "This right," he says, "settles forever the agitating question of American Slavery;" and boastfully declares that "our new gov-

ernment is the first in the history of the world, based upon this great physical, philosophical, and *moral* truth."

The announcement is a sufficient notice to all the world. The establishment of the Southern confederacy is not alone the setting up of a new power upon the earth, but the introduction into the public law of the civilized world of a NEW RIGHT; and into the family of nations of a NEW FORM OF CIVILIZATION.

It is in this aspect of our struggle, that it becomes of the deepest interest to the people of France and to all men. An attempt to supplant the laws founded by the Divine Master of these Christian centuries, by a new code, derived from the reeking shambles of the King of Dahomey, is an enterprise in which the people of the United States are not alone interested.

Is it possible that the idea can be anywhere entertained, that the glory of France or the permanent well-being of her people, requires the successful prosecution of this atrocious enterprise on this continent? Will she aid in the overthrow of a nationality founded upon the principles of her own great revolution, and cemented by the blood of her noblest sons, for the sake of any profits to be derived from the meretricious embraces of such an ally? At the South they make a commerce out of their own blood, when it flows under a colored skin. That doubtless is in accordance with the new confederate code. For the sake of national recognition, the new confederate power would allow any respectable nation to participate in all the benefits of this commerce as well as of the trade in cotton. We cannot be persuaded that France will be the first to take advantage of the offer.

If at the instant of the slave master's attempt to force the new right into the public code of the Christian world, the governments of France and England had promptly refused to accept it —if they had simply declared that no state founded upon any such atrocious right should ever be admitted into the family of

Christian nations—the struggle would never have taken the disastrous form of war. There would have been no idle and starving spinners and weavers in Lancashire, no unemployed and famishing workpeople at Rouen and Mulhouse. Even now these governments have it in their power to say the word that shall at once put an end to the pernicious hopes that prolong our disasters, and the continually more and more aggravated sufferings of their own peoples.

As for us, we know now that the issues at stake, in the war which we wage, belong to humanity; we know also how momentous they are, and that the great question is not as to the day or month or year in which peace shall be declared, but as to the hour in which the *impious right* organized by the slave power into a Confederacy of States, shall be utterly overthrown and extinguished. If we doubted as to our duty in such a crisis, we should turn to one of you and learn, that "a People accustomed to liberty, should risk their last man and their last dollar to keep the inheritance of their fathers"—"that the dismemberment of the Union—the rending asunder of the country, would be degradation without remedy."

We would by no means speak boastfully of the military successes of the armies of the Union. A singularly peaceful people, like those of the Northern States, do not learn war in a day. Besides, this is emphatically a war of ideas, and they take time to put on their armor and march. Still, an inspection of the map of the insurgent States, will show you, that some portion of every one of them, is already in the occupation of our military forces. Let us assure you, that the present condition of these forces, both physically and morally, never was as good as at this hour, nor their future success so well assured. At the same time, let us further assure you that the resources of the people of the loyal States, both in men and money, remain unexhausted, and still adequate, as we believe, to the work which Providence has committed to their hands.

And again thanking you for the many just and inspiring words you have spoken in behalf of the great cause for which we fight, let us express to you our hope and our belief, that when the end of our battle shall come, neither you nor we shall be made ashamed by the result.

With sentiments of the highest individual esteem we remain, respectfully yours,

COUNCIL.

CHARLES KING,
GEORGE OPDYKE,
WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT,
JOHN A. STEVENS,
JOHN J. CISCO,
MORRIS KETCHUM,
WILLIAM CURTIS NOYES,
C. V. S. ROOSEVELT,
WILLIAM F. CARY,
JOHN C. GREEN,
CHARLES A. HECKSCHER,
FRANCIS LIEBER,
JAMES McKAYE,
WILLIAM E. DODGE,
FRANCIS GEO. SHAW,
ROBERT BAYARD,
CHARLES BUTLER,
JAS. W. WHITE,
W. H. WEBB,
E. CAYLUS,
MOSES TAYLOR.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

JOHN COCHRANE,
GEORGE GRISWOLD,
FRANKLIN H. DELANO,
JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS, JR.,
J. BUTLER WRIGHT,
JAMES A. ROOSEVELT,
ADRIAN ISELIN,
THOMAS N. DALE,
WOLCOTT GIBBS,
WILLIAM A. HALL,
ISAAC H. BAILEY,
GEORGE CABOT WARD,
JOHN JAY,
C. E. DETMOLD,
ROBERT LENOX KENNEDY,
FREDERICK C. WAGNER,
GEORGE P. PUTNAM,
THEODORE G. GLAUBENSKLEE,
WILLIAM E. DODGE, JR.,
PARKE GODWIN,
ORISON BLUNT,
WILLIAM T. BLODGETT,
SYDNEY HOWARD GAY,
WILLIAM ORTON.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LOYAL NATIONAL LEAGUE.

At a Meeting of the Council and Executive Committee of the Loyal National League of New York, held on the 23d March, 1863, it was unanimously

Resolved, That the officers of the Loyal National League, have heard with interest and satisfaction that the Loyal Publication Society of the city have in course of preparation letters of thanks to the able defenders of the cause of our National Unity in England and France, among whom are included those distinguished advocates of civil liberty, whose fame is not circumscribed by country, or by race, John Stuart Mill, Richard Cobden, John Bright, I. F. Cairnes, Newman Hall, and others, in England, and Edouard Laboulaye, Agenor de Gasparin, and others, in France; and they request, in behalf of the League, that these letters may be submitted to the Council of this League; and on approval, be recommended for adoption at the Great Mass Meeting, to be called on the 11th of April, on Union Square, to the end that these noble men, loyal to the principle of nationality, may receive a just acknowledgment of their service from a free and grateful people.

Charles King,
Chairman.

James A. Roosevelt,
Secretary.

ADOPTION OF THE LETTER BY THE LOYAL NATIONAL LEAGUE.

In accordance with the request of the Loyal National League, an address was drafted by Mr. James McKaye, on behalf of of the Loyal Publication Society, which was submitted to the great mass meeting of the League, on Union Square, on the 11th of April, and adopted with enthusiasm.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LOYAL NATIONAL LEAGUE.

A MEETING OF THE COUNCIL AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE LOYAL NATIONAL LEAGUE WAS HELD AT THE HALL OF THE LEAGUE ON THE 18TH DECEMBER, 1863, IN PURSUANCE OF THE FOLLOWING CALL:

HALL OF THE LOYAL NATIONAL LEAGUE,
813 Broadway, N. Y.

Dear Sir:

A letter of reply to "The Address of the Loyal National League to Messrs. the Count de GASPARIN, LABOULAYE, COCHIN, MARTIN, and other friends of America in France," has been lately received. A translation will be read to the Council and Executive Committee on Friday Evening next, 18th inst., at 8 P. M., at the Hall of the League.

Your presence is particularly requested at the hour named.

Respectfully yours,

FRANCIS LIEBER,
JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS, JR.

December 15, 1863.

Hon. JOHN COCHRANE was called to the chair.

Mr. JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS, Jr., appointed Secretary.

Dr. FRANCIS LIEBER stated that he had received by the hands of Mr. SAMUEL B. RUGGLES, from Mr. EDOUARD LABOULAYE, of Paris, the "Reply of Messrs. GASPARIN, LABOULAYE, COCHIN, MARTIN, and other friends of America in France," to the Address of the League; that a translation had been made, at his request, by Mr. JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS, Jr., which would now be read to the Joint Committee.

The translation was then read by Mr. STEVENS, and on motion, unanimously accepted and adopted.

At the instance of Mr. STEVENS he was authorized to have a copy of the translation handsomely engrossed and forwarded to the Hon. S. P. CHASE, Secretary of the Treasury, with a request to place it in the hands of the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES prior to its publication.

On motion, Dr. FRANCIS LIEBER, Mr. JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS, Jr., and CHARLES BUTLER, Esq., were appointed a Committee to superintend the publication of the original and translation of the Reply, together with the Letter of the League, and to take such measures in conjunction with a Committee of the LOYAL PUBLICATION SOCIETY of New York as shall be necessary to this end.

On motion, it was *Resolved* that the translated Reply be published simultaneously in the New York *Tribune*, *Times* and *Herald*, if arrangements can be satisfactorily made.

On motion, it was *Ordered*, that ten thousand copies of the translated Reply be printed, and a sufficient number of copies of the original French letter and the complete pamphlet.

On motion, it was *Ordered*, that the original manuscript be handsomely bound and presented to the managers of the METROPOLITAN FAIR in behalf of the Sanitary Commission.

On motion Dr. FRANCIS LIEBER was requested to acknowledge receipt of the letter to Mr. LABOULAYE at an early day.

And with expressions of admiration for the noble sentiments of the Letter, and of renewed gratitude to our French friends, the Committee adjourned.

JOHN COCHRANE,
Chairman.

JOHN AUSTIN STEVENS, Jr.,
Secretary.

71.2004.084.00012

